THE RULE OF CATHOLICK FAITH:

Sever'd from the Opinions of the *Schools*, Miſtakes of the Ignorant, and abuſes of the Vulgar.

Written in French by *Francis Veron*, Dr. of Divinity, Preacher and Profeſſor Royal of Controverſie, and Paſtor of *Charenton*.

Deputed by the Clergy of France for this Work.

Tranſlated by *E. S.* Eſq.

Phil. 3. 16. *ut idem Sapiamus, in eadem permaneamus* REGULA.

PARIS.
Printed by *John Billaine*, 1660.

The TRANSLATOR to the READER.

MY first perusal of this short Treatise furnish'd me both with a Zeal and Resolution of presenting it to my dear Country-men; and chiefly to those, who, justly solicitous of the important truth of Religion, have taken much pains in sifting variety of Authors, and for want of an exact separation of what is, from what is not absolutely necessary *for a child of the holy Catholick Church to adhere to, have engaged themselves in most intricate and endless difficulties.*

And really, when I consider the heat of our School-men in defence of their Problematical

Opinions, and the Arts of our Adversaries in covering their Errors with the vail of Scripture, I cannot but tenderly commiserate the condition of such as are out of the way, and contribute the utmost of my endeavors to bring them acquainted with a Guide *that may direct their wandrings, and sustain their weakness, and render their great Journey both short, easie, and secure.*

For this Intent, I think it not amiss to acquaint the Reader with some particulars which I have received from Persons of Honor and credit, concerning the Author, not only of this, but of many other Books of Controversy, as well in French as Latin, in both which Languages he

sometimes

ſometimes wrote upon the ſame Queſtions, as in the very Book I here preſent you, whereof to make the Traſlation more plain and uſefull, I have in ſome few periods borrowed out of the Latine what our Author has added there, and was wanting in the French Copy.

He was generally known in France by the name of Pere Veron, much renowned for his Eloquence and variety of Learning, but moſt admir'd for his great zeal and unwearied induſtry in recovering ſouls from the giddy diſeaſe of Hereſie. He was for many years a Father of the Society of Jeſus, and, as well at the earneſt deſire of ſome Reverend Prelates of France, as by the

consent of his Superiours released from that obligation, to employ with more freedome his talent, in reducing those who had sever'd themselves from the Communion of the Church.

He preach'd many years in Paris, with admirable success, and there also taught a Lesson of Controversie, which begat many Disputations and Conferences both with Ministers and other learned persons of the contrary perswasion; in all which he remain'd still more then Conqueror. He was a person truly humble and circumspect in what he undertook, and particularly in framing this Rule of Faith, wherein he resolved not to march alone, but in the company of the most renowned

Divines

Divines of this later age.

After some years spent at Paris, he was sent into those parts of France, where Calvinism had taken deepest root, as Bearn, Languedoque, &c. This he perform'd with a vigor proportionable to the greatness of his work, and in all encounters highly prevail'd against his Antagonists, by cleaving close to his Rule of Faith, and not permitting them to obtrude any Proposition upon the Church, which she did not own for Faith; insomuch that the Ministers of those Quarters (after many Conferences and Disputations) entred into a mutual League and Covenant, obliging themselves not to dispute any more with Pere Veron upon any tearms. For, by holding fast

to his former Method, he never fail'd to reduce his Adversaries to this exigency, that they must acknowledg the Text of Scripture did not contradict the Doctrine of the Roman Church, though the affirmative is that which they constantly and confidently hold forth, both in their Books and Sermons.

This puts me in minde of what some years since I heard in Oxford, from a person of honor, and
L. Falk. a great champion of the Protestant cause, directing his speech to some Divines of that University. That, though he had a particular gust for the study of Controversie, yet he never thought his time worse spent, than in frequenting the Sermons of such

such who pretended most to oppose the Church of Rome, in regard they seldome stated the Question so right that the Papists were really concern'd in the Doctrine they oppugned, and by that means they spent much time, and many words, in confuteing an Adversary of their own framing; an Observation which I every day finde confirm'd in Protestant writers, and may justly far more suspect the same proceeding in their Preachers.

The Intention of our Author is to remove all mistakes in matter of Controversie, and to bring his Reader home to the Question, freed from all needless and impertinent diversions; to the end he may sooner attain a clear solu-

tion of his Doubts, the true and only ſcope of a Controvertiſt. But ſince ſupernatural verities have no entrance into the underſtanding of man, without the powerfull aſſiſtance of ſupernatural Grace, it is that which I humbly beg of Almighty God for all my dear Countrymen, involv'd in the ſad confuſion of Opinions, that, by reſting ſafe in the judgement and boſome of the holy Catholique Church, they may enjoy a contented minde in this world, and eternal felicity in the next.

E. S.

To

To the LORDS of the Assembly General of the Clergy sitting at PARIS.

My Lords!

I Present you with, and submit to your Judgments this Piece, of a choice and singular nature, design'd for the Groundwork of a Temple of Christian Peace; projected by a *David*, a man of war, but by Divine Providence reserv'd for the peaceable *Salomon*, your *Assembly*; whose weapons are not the temporal Sword, but *that of the spirit, which is the Word of God*: to you, I say, who are the *Pastors and Doctors*, given by God to his Church, *to the consummation of the Saints, to the edifying of the Body of Christ, till we all meet in the Unity of Faith, and knowledg of the Son of God, into a perfect man, that we be*

Card. *Richl.*

no longer Children, wavering and carried about with every winde of Doctrine, by the fallacy of men, by their cunning craftily to ſeduce.

This *David* had paſſionately deſir'd to crown his warlike Actions with theſe Olive-branches of Peace; or, in caſe he had ſhut up the Temple of *Janus*, his ordinary place of Reſidence, then to build up this of Peace, and had appointed the moſt neceſſary materials for raiſing this Edifice, and diſpoſed above 50 Miniſters of *Hiram to hew the trees of Lebanon*, who would in ſome one of their Synods have declared themſelves. He had peradventure mingled together, *gold, ſilver, pretious ſtones, wood, hay, ſtubble: Every mans work ſhall be manifeſted, for the day of our Lord ſhall declare it; and fire ſhall try what the work of every one is: If any mans work burn, it ſhall be loſt.* However it be, God granted him not the honor of raiſing

raising this Structure, much less of seeing it brought to perfection. That glory he hath reserved for you. The first course of stones, in laying the foundation of this House, ought to be that wherewith I now present you, *these corner stones, to make the two parties into one, and break down the middle wall of partition.*

'Tis incredible, in what number, and with what applause *the strangers of the house of God* flock'd to the Church of S. *German Des-prez*, as also with what constancy they continued it, when (not only by command, but of my own inclination) I laid the first course of all these stones orally in my Sermons, and in small printed Pamphlets, which I published the same weeks, that so these things might firmlier be retain'd, and more attentively consider'd. The Title I gave them was, *The Means of Christian Peace.* This I continued for some years; I mean,

the

the Doctrine of the Catholique Faith exactly ſever'd from all other, upon theſe ſubjects, *viz. Of Merits: Of the Primacy of the Church, eſpecially of that reſiding in the Pope: Of the Euchariſt, and Adoration of Chriſt therein; Of the Sacrifice of the Maſs: Of the honor given to Saints, and to their Images and Reliques: and of praying to them: Of Satisfaction, even for others: Of Purgatory, and Prayers for the dead: Of the Treaſure of the Church, and Indulgences.*

The diſownings I made on every of theſe ſubjects, in each Sermon, and the miſunderſtanding of our Doctrine which I demonſtrated, did ſo amaze, qualifie, and change all thoſe of *Charenton* then preſent (among whom were many of divers Provinces and Towns, even of the moſt obſtinate in their Separatiſm) that, at their departure from the Church, they ſaid, in a manner aloud;

aloud; *They could willingly receive the Catholique Doctrine, in caſe it were ſuch, and no other, and ſhould perſwade their brethren to embrace it.*

And had not ſome perſons, (whom I ſhall take for *Zealots*, but ill inſtructed in our Religion, as well as ignorant in Divinity, not having frequented thoſe Schools, and whoſe Zeal was like that reprehended by S. *Paul*, *which is not according to knowledg*,) had not thoſe, I ſay, poſſeſt the ears of ſome Learned men, and by their means the ears alſo of certain Great Ones, ſpreading a falſe Report; *That I ſlackned ſome points in our Religion* (an execrable Sacriledg;) *that I propoſed accommodations in Faith, without pretending that the Separatiſts ſhould come back to us intirely; that I preach'd up a third Party; that I adher'd to one, who troubled the pretended*

pretended Reformers, yet was not himself sufficiently disingaged from their crime; that I was, as it were, his Conductor, and the Supporter of his Errours, then mingled with our Catholique Truths, which within these few Moneths he has embrac'd intire and clear from all exceptions; If those Calumniators had not, I say, by their false rumors interrupted my course in laying these Fundamental stones three several times, during the space of three Voyages made by his Majesty (though, upon the dissipation of that Calumny, I as often resumed the Work) *these foundations, and the beginning of the building had appear'd long since above ground,* especially, *in the last National Synod of the Ministers,* the principal Architect having, so long as he lived, at his dispose, all that was requisite for the intire raising of this great Building; especially the defraying

of

of persons imployed, the interposition of sundry Laborers, the Sermons of many Learned men, and whatever else; and having so begun, that even after his death, in the Provincial Synod of *Charenton*, held in *January* last, there were many of the Assembled well-disposed to listen to the commenced Treaty of Peace; but no man appeared on our part to promote the design, the chief Undertaker being deceased, and a long Sickness tying me to my bed, disabled me for all sollicitation, which is pressingly requisite in a business of this nature.

True it is, that from the time of the said Death to this day, I have forborn to speak of this Subject, as well in my publick Sermons or Lessons Royal of Controversie, as in my Writings, to avoid the Scandal, which perchance some *misinformed persons* might have taken thereat; besides, my endeavors would have

have prov'd but vain and effectleſs, who am only capable of being *inſtrumental* to another; ſaving that on the occaſion of the above-mentioned *Provincial Synod* of the *Miniſters* held upon the very Territory of my Flock at *Charenton*, I caus'd to be preſented to them, in full Synod, this RULE, ſolemnly approved by ſeveral Doctors, hereafter mentioned.

But now, beholding you aſſembled, to whom alone appartains this great Enterpriſe of the Converſion, and generall Reduction of theſe of the pretended reform'd Religion to the Catholique, Apoſtolique, and Roman Church, to your Folds, from whence they ſtrayed, principally by their *miſ-underſtandings* of the Doctrine you teach, I preſent my ſelf to your Lordſhips, humbly beſeeching to be heard on this ſubject, in your full Aſſembly, ſuccinctly now, hereafter

hereafter more at large before your Commissaries, who may examin the Contents of this *Book*, and the whole design, whereby to make you a Faithfull and solid Report thereof; whereupon you may please to take such resolutions as your great Zeal and Learning shall suggest to you touching this Work; either to take it in hand, and perfect it, or, if the Conjecture of affaires will not now permit it, at least to approve this *Rule*, and the Applications of it, by your high Authorities, who are *our onely proper Judges* with Jurisdiction, of the Doctrine, which all shall receive from your Sacred mouths, as undoubtedly proceeding from the Church; this being the sole thing that seems desired by many of the Separatists for their returning to the Catholique Communion. These are the Prayers he offers, and this the Account

count he gives you of his Actions, ſince your laſt general Aſſembly, who is,

(My Lords)

Your moſt humble and obedient Servant and Miſſioner,

Charenton,
15th of *Sept.*
1645.

Francis Veron.

The

THe Names of those Doctors, who approved this Book, and the Contents thereof, and whose particular Approbations are printed at large in the first Edition hereof in French, and their Names only inserted in the second, which this Translation follows.

Jaques Hennequin: Hemere: Pererret: du Fresne de Mince: Chapelas: Canta: Brousse: Judas: de Machi: Flavigny: de St. Simon: de Fountaines: Fremont: Marechau.

The

Errata.

In Preface: Page 4. line 1. read, that *if* in. and p.5. r. *opposed*.

In the Book: P.11.l.18.r.*as* my. p.13. l.16.r.*was* offered.p.16.l.24.r.Dispositive. p.17.l.11.del.II, p.31.l.1.r.*Decrees*. p.51. l.14.r.*resolved*. p.72.l.2.r.*of* venial. p.75. l.5. r.*latria*. p.84.l.13. r.require, p.123. l.4.r.*we*.l.15.r.*the*.p.112.l.last,*after* Prototype,*add*[:].p.147.l.22.r.than *any*,l.23. r.nor *any*. p.183.l.2.r.*pious*. p.200. l.12. r. *good*. p.206. l.9.r.*John*. p.28. l.last,r. not *to* be.

The CONTENTS.

The Authors Preface.

Chap. 2. *The General Rule of the Catholique Faith,* Page 1.

Chap. 3. *Particular Matters: of Merit and Inherent Justice,* 21

Chap. 4. *Of the Pope,* 35

Chap. 5. *Of the Eucharist,* 52

Chap. 6. *Of the Sacrifice of the Mass,* 64

Chap. 7. *Of the Adoration of the Eucharist,* 73

Chap. 8. *Of the Honor due to Saints,* 85

Chap. 9. *Of the Invocation of Saints,* 90

Chap. 10. *Of the honor given to Images,* 104

Chap. 11. *Of Satisfaction.* 115

Chap. 12. *Of Satisfactions, and Merits for another man.* 130

Chap.

The Contents.

Chap. 13. *Concerning the Treasure of Satisfaction from the Merits of Saints,* page 141
Chap. 14. *Of Purgatory,* 146
Chap. 15. *Of Suffrages for the dead,* 151
Chap. 16. *Of Indulgences,* 159
Chap. 17. *What certainty there is in the aforesaid Doctrines,* 171
Chap. 18. *What is less certain concerning Indulgences,* 180
Chap. 19. *Of the Obligation due to Constitutions and humane Lawes, as well Ecclesiastical as Civil,* 189
Chap. 20. *Concerning some Errors proceeding from Ignorance, which ought to be laid aside.* 203
Chap. 21. *The benefit of thus separating Faith from Opinions.* 209

The

THE Authors PREFACE.

IT much imports, both in Political and Spiritual warrs, as well for defence of places beſieged, to retrench themſelves ſtrongly, and abandon thoſe Outworks that are either untenable or unprofitable; as in the Attaque of others to aſſault fitly, when the breach is fair, and the force ſufficient to carry the Town: I intend by this, to our purpoſe, that the Means particularly proper, whither to maintain our Catholique Religion againſt all ſorts of Sectaries, or to convince them of their Errours, and reduce them to the ancient Unity, is, Exactly to ſeparate the Articles of our Catholique Faith; To wit, ſuch as all are obliged to ſubmit to under pain of Hereſie, and Excommunication, from thoſe other

Doctrines, which have not attained so high dignity, and which we commonly tearm Scholastical Questions, *the greater part whereof are esteem'd onely Problematical, and the other (whatever their certitude is) are not held to be of Faith, as also from some Opinions and abuses, which, by the ignorant zeal of weak brains, have gained footing among the Vulgar, much to the prejudice of Religion.*

These I intend exactly to separate from those other, which are truely controverted betwixt us and our Adversaries, yet still with a just regard due to the several Opinions, condemning onely the Abuses, and in a word to represent to the Reader the Catholique Doctrine in her native beauty, full of splendor and vigor, against the surprisal of our Opposites, who with much Art and fraud endeavour to make her appear ugly and deformed, and by that means more

than

than any other foment the preſent Diviſions, repreſenting to their followers our Church quite other than it is.

Many ten, I confeſs, of our modern Preachers and Doctors, not underſtanding, or not well diſcerning what is of Faith, and what is diſputable in the Schools, have ſo confounded theſe Doctrines, as thereby divers have been retarded in their ſubmiſſion to the Church, and many ſtand at a diſtance, who (were they rightly informed) would willingly ſubmit to the Catholique Doctrines; *which, if repreſented in their own purity, are clear and manifeſt in the Divine Oracles, in the Councils, and in all Antiquities; but if mingled with the Opinions of the Schools, loſe much of their ſolidity. In ſhort, miſunderſtanding both on one ſide and on the other contributes much to this Diviſion; and I dare pronounce, that this miſunderſtanding is ſo generally the*

cauſe of our differences, that in 30 or 40 points debated between us, we ſhould agree to take it away, two thirds of the Controverſies would ceaſe, and we ſhould immediately find our ſelves ſo far united.

It is now 25 years ſince I firſt made good this reduction, both in my Sermons and Books, as alſo in very many Conferences with ſeveral Miniſters, even in the parts of France *moſt infected with Hereſie, and this with ſo great an improvement, that thouſands have been gained to the Catholike Church, and reſted ſafe in her boſome. I have alſo, for ſome years paſt, in this City of* Paris *continued the ſame method in my Sermons, with great concourſe of both parties, in a hopefull way of reducing* France *to the exerciſe of one ſole Religion; (A thing much to be deſired both for the good of ſouls and tranquility of the Civil Government:) But certain perſons, either*

ill

ill-informed or ignorant, have by another kind of misunderstanding still opposed and counterpointed my endeavours.

I intend here amply to explain my self, without offence to any, that the clearness of my proceeding may remove the mistake, and afford some benefit to the Reader. For, to performe this work exactly, it is necessary to be well vers'd as well in Controversie as School-Divinity, and particularly in the Authors of these times, (a perfection few attain to) and since our Ministers of France have little of School-Divinity among them, they can hardly arrive at the knowledg of a just separation in what belongs to to Faith, and what to Opinion; Besides that often upon malice, and to foment a division, whatsoever Bellarmine, or any other Author writes (though not in quality of an Article of Faith, but expresly delivering it as a problematical Opinion belong-

ing to the Schools) they confidently
oppose, as the Doctrine of the Church.
Bellarmine, *saith* du Moulin, (*who*
writes at the Popes feet) *saith, thus*
and thus, not taking notice at all
that what he delivers is onely by way
opinion.

On the contrary, most of our Di-
vines employ themselves wholly, du-
ring their promotion in the Universi-
ty, to School-Divinity, few or none to
Controversie, their exercises altogether
consisting in the subtle and sublime
Doctrine of the Schools. From thence
they betake themselves either to the
pulpit or Government of the Church.
How is it possible that these men
should be exact in controversie? few
addicting themselves at all to that
study, and scarce any that continue
long, and grow aged in the employ-
ment, and yet far more scarce is the
number of such as have well digested
both the practical and speculative
part by frequent Communications and

Con-

Conferences with our Adverſaries, though the dignity of this cauſe requires many ſhould be compleated in that ſtudy, and the parts that compoſe it; as Scripture, Councils, Fathers, Languages, Hiſtories, beſides School-Divinity.

From hence reſults, as a neceſſary Conſequence, that this exact ſeparation cannot be made without an accurate knowledge of thoſe Points that ought to be diſtinguiſh'd, and that the number is but ſmall of ſuch as are able to perform the work; yet, what can there be more ſuitable to reaſon, than onely to propoſe, in matter of Faith, what is neceſſary? Why ſhould we oblige ſuch as are yet to be reduced, to ſubmit to more then what the Church propoſeth? Is there not difficulty enough to perſwade them to this? is not the contrary a means to divert them? Does it not ſavour of inhumanity, to make the way harder then it is of its own nature? whereas

we are obliged in reaſon and by Divine Precept to render the burthen light, and the yoak eaſie.

For theſe Reaſons I thought it expedient to deliver by way of Preface my ſence of this exact Separation, that we may collect into one what hereafter will be dilated in ſeverall ſubjects. Firſt, I eſtabliſh the General Rule of Faith, *and then I diſtinguiſh in each particular matter that which is of obligation to be believed, from all other Doctrines whatſoever, as well by the Application of this* Rule, *as by fortifying my ſelf with the Opinions of our moſt renowned modern Divines, that I may not appear particular in mine own.*

'Tis true, none of our Doctors have yet pubiſhed to the world this Rule, *accompanied with theſe exact Applications, and yet I offer nothing contrary to their ſence, but rather what is generally agreed upon; inſomuch that if my words be not abus'd by*

Additions

Additions or Miſunderſtandings, but taken as I ſpeak them, no man can oppoſe this Doctrine, without contradicting the general Tenet of our Divines, and incurring the cenſure of introducing a Novelty. For you muſt note particularly, that when I ſay, ſuch a Propoſition is not an Article of Faith, *I do not intend thereby to deny the* Truth *of it, in which many are eaſily deceived, but ſince my Intention is, to perſwade them to be* Catholiques, *who are not in the Church, what need I undertake to teach them more then what conduceth to that end? Or, why ſhould I peſter their underſtandings with unneceſſary Queſtions? for my part I take my ſelf bound to paſs over ſuch points with ſilence; now,* Abſtrahentium non eſt mendacium. *When I call this Reduction or Converſion of our Adverſaries A Reunion, 'tis to be underſtood, of perſons, not of* Doctrines, *which can be no more united than the light with*

nefs; but as they ſeparated themſelves from the Church by Hereſie, either in adhering to their Parents, or upon the ſcore of their own particular Opinions, ſo, by an entire Profeſſion of Catholique verities, they are re-united, and freed from excommunication, by the hands of thoſe to whom God Almighty hath beſtowed the power of Abſolution: and this is the full Sum of my Intention in this Preface.

CHAP.

CHAP. 2.

The GENERAL RULE of the Catholique Faith.

THE total and only *Rule* of the *Catholique Faith*, to which all are obliged, under pain of Hereſie and Excommunication is, DIVINE REVELATION DELIVERED TO THE PROPHETS AND APOSTLES, PROPOSED BY THE CATHOLIQUE CHURCH IN HER GENERAL COUNCILS, OR BY HER UNIVERSAL PRACTICE, TO BE BELIEVED AS AN ARTICLE OF CATHOLIQUE FAITH. All that is of this nature, is an *Article* or Doctrine of *Faith*; And no other Doctrine can be of Faith, if either the firſt Condition fail, to wit, Divine Revelation, or the ſecond,

ſecond, which is, a Propoſal by the Univerſal Church. All other Doctrines are of an inferiour allay, certain or probable, true or falſe, according to their ſeveral Circumſtances and qualities.

According to this *General Rule*, which hath no exception, all that is deſign'd and propos'd, as Doctrine, revealed by God in General Councils, or by the general practice of the Church, is an *Article of Faith*; ſuch for example is that which is contained in the uſual form of our Profeſſion of Faith, extracted by Pope *Pius* the 4th out of the Council of *Trent*, (in which he preſided by his Legates,) or out of any other general Council.

For want of either or both of theſe conditions requiſite, there can be no Article of Faith. No Doctrine is to be believed with Divine Faith ſince the Apoſtles times, though even miracles have been done in

con-

confirmation of it; nor any Revelation to any Saint, ſince the Apoſtles, contained in the lives of Saints, nor any Miracle reported in their Legends ought to be believed as of faith, though the miracles were written by moſt holy perſons, as S. *Jerome*, S. *Athanaſius*, S. *Auſtin*, S. *Gregory* the Great, or any other never ſo grave Author, or even reported and approved by General Councils, as, by that of the ſecond of *Nice*, *act.* 4. and that of *Baſil*, concerning the Revelations of S *Bridget*, or in the *Buls* of the canonization of Saints: The reaſon is, that either both the two conditions or one of them is wanting in all thoſe inſtances: the Revelations are not made either to the Prophets or Apoſtles, nor the Miracles performed by them: Neither is it, for the moſt part, the Univerſal Church that propoſeth them, but ſome particular men; and if the Authors be grave, their Teſtimony will carry more

more or leſs Authority with it (yet ſtill but humane) according to their different qualities.

Some of theſe Writers, as *Jacobus de Voragine* in his golden Legend, *Simon Metaphraſtes* in the Saints lives, and particularly, in thoſe of S. *Chriſtopher*, S. *George*, S. *Urſula*, S. *Margaret*, and ſeveral other Martyrs, do relate divers paſſages much to the prejudice of truth, and diſhonor of the Saints, which are learnedly corrected both by *Baronius*, and *Ribadinera*. And yet in their works may ſtill remain ſomething uncertain, or falſe, according to the credit of the Authors by whom they were guided. But, in fine (as I ſaid before) nothing of all this belongs to *Catholique Faith*, but onely to humain Authority: As alſo the Miracles reported by S. *Auſtin*, and other grave Authors, though they confirm the Catholique Faith, yet are they not the *Foundation* of it.

No

No Doctrine grounded upon Scripture, diverſly interpreted either by the Ancient Fathers, or our modern Doctors, is an Article of Faith; For, ſuch a Doctrine, though it may be revealed, yet the Revelation is not aſcertaind to us, nor propoſed by the Church; and I inſiſt only upon that ſcore. Nor can thoſe Doctrines, (which we properly call School-Divinity, and whoſe nature tis to be diſputable) be eſteemed within the compaſs of Faith; nor any Propoſition which can be proved onely by Conſequences drawn from Scripture, although the Conſequences were certain and evident, and deduced from two Propoſitions of Scripture, much leſs, which commonly happens, when one Propoſition onely is from the Revealed Word. Theſe Doctrines are notwithſtanding certain, when the Premiſſes are ſo; and probable, when the Premiſſes

Premiſes arrive no higher ; This commonly happens in the debate of School-queſtions , which never come within the compaſs of Faith; much leſs do the Arguments of our Adverſaries, in points controverted, who pretend no farther then by deductions out of Scripture to prove their aſſertions , which, were they true, yet could not be of Faith.

As for *Gracians Decrees*, and the *Gloſſe*, they can claim nothing of Faith , the Author being a particular Doctor, and ſubject to many miſtakes , even in the citation of Authors , nor does he pretend to any ſuch thing ; much leſs weight has the Gloſſe , then the Decrees, where many ſilly and ridiculous paſſages are diſcovered.

As for the Papal Decrees, contained in the body of the Canon Law, or publiſhed ſince, none of them do conſtitute an Article of Faith ; for, certainly the greateſt part

part of theſe Decretals contained in the body of the Canon Law, are but Rules of Government and Policy for the Biſhops Courts, by which the Judges are directed in deciding cauſes, and principally in collating Benefices. Beſides theſe, there are in them very many particular Anſwers of Popes to ſome Biſhops; but how they ſhould come to be deemed Articles of Faith, I cannot ſo much as gueſs. *Bellarmine*, who, (to uſe *du Moulins* Phraſe) writes at the Popes feet, maketh no difficulty to acknowledg errours in ſeveral of them. As for example, where the Canon out of *Gracian* is objected, *Quod propoſuiſti*: extracted out of *Gregory* the 3d. where it is ſaid, *That, if a woman ſhould be ſick, and by that means unable to render her duty to her husband, the husband, if he have not the gift of*

Controv. de Pontif. Romano, lib. 4. ch. 12.

of continency may take another wife: He replyeth thus, *That the Pope fail'd, through ignorance, which we do not deny may happen to Popes, when they do not properly define, but onely declare their opinions, as* Gregory *seems here to have done.* This anſwer of the Cardinal ſhowes, how little force there is in any Objection drawn from the Decretals, ſince in theſe the Popes declare only their Opinions, without defining what is of Faith.

That alſo is not eſteemed an Article of Faith, which is defined in Provincial Councils, though the Pope ſhould preſide in perſon, or by his Legates; and the reaſon is, that the ſecond condition is alwayes wanting in this caſe, and very often the firſt. *Bellarmine, lib. 4. cap. 2* treating this ſubject in the foreſaid Controverſie, produces three Opinions currant among Catholiques; the firſt, that the Pope,

as

as Pope, may be an Heretique, and teach Hereſie, if he doth define without a General Council; ſome Doctors of *Paris* have defended this Opinion, as *Gerſon* and *Almanus*, in their Books of Eccleſiaſtical Power. *Alphonſus deCaſtro* againſt Hereſies, and Pope *Adrian* in the Queſtion of Confirmation. Theſe ſeem to place the judgment of *Infallibility* in matters of Faith, not in the Pope alone, but in the whole Church, that is in the Pope, and a General Council. The ſecond, whether the Pope may be an Heretique, or no, yet he cannot define any thing heretical, directed to the whole Church. The third Opinion is, that the Pope cannot in any wayes be an Heretick, nor publickly teach Hereſie, though he undertake to define of himſelf.

The firſt Opinion is not properly Heretical; ſince we ſee the Church cenſures not thoſe that maintain it, yet, it ſeems very erroneous, and

next

next to Hereſie. The ſecond is the moſt certain, and to be affirmed. The third is probable, but not certain: Thus *Bellarmine*; whom I therefore have ſo largely cited, to wipe away their Calumny who blame me for ſaying, *That the Definitions of the Pope*, ex cathedra, *out of a General Council, are not of Catholique Faith*; which I again *ſo* affirm, that I conclude it a moſt certain truth, according to the Opinion of all Doctors, even *Bellarmine* himſelf; who expreſly ſayes, the firſt Opinion is not Heretical; nor do I agree with *Bellarmine*, that it is Erroneous, and next to Hereſie, and himſelf indeed ſayes it but tenderly, and with a *videtur*: For, it doth not ſeem ſo to all, who think it rather temerarious, to accuſe *Gerſon*, *Almainus*, and *Adrianus*, of erroneous, and neer-heretical Opinions.

Beſides, its evident, even out of *Bellarmine*, that it is not defin'd by the

the Church, that the Pope (not in a General Council) is infallible, nor his Definitions of *Catholique Faith*: So that all Divines agree, that *such* a Doctrine is not of *Catholick Faith*; this was all I said, and is most certain; which my Calumniators, through precipitancy of judgment, observed not.

Which of these 3 Opinions I follow, is not to my purpose, yet, I rather adhere to the second, but without censuring the first, my business being to reduce Separatists to the Caththolique Faith, without medling with any other Doctrine. I did not say, that such Definitions were not of Faith; my Adversaries conceived, but I only said, and I say it again, That they are not of *Catholique Faith*, or which all, as Catholiques, are bound to hold, as of Faith, and the contrary to which is Heretical, and removes from the bosome of the Church; yet do all confesse,

confeſſe, what is decreed by the Biſhop of ſo great a Sea, is of weighty Authority, though only aſſiſted by his private Council, or writing onely privately to ſome Biſhops; and yet of more weight are his Decrees in a Provincial Synod, but moſt of all, when, *ex Cathedra*, propoſing ſuch Decrees to the whole Church, either in his private Council, or Provincial Synod; and 'tis a raſhneſs not to admit ſuch Determinations.

Wherefore theſe Cenſurers proceed too haſtily, and their Cenſure deſerves a Cenſure, as offering to introduce a new Doctrine, to be believed as of Catholick Faith, which no one as yet has held; to wit, that what is defin'd by the Pope *ex Cathedra*, (out of a General Council) is of *Catholique Faith*, and to be believed under pain of Hereſie.

Vide *lat. Edit.* p. 526.

The practice even of the Univerſal

verſal Church is no ſufficient ground for an Article of Catholique Faith, by reaſon the Object of Faith is *Truth*; and oftentimes the Church proceeds in matter of Practice, upon probable Opinions, and this probability is ſufficient to juſtifie the Practice, which the Church alſo upon juſt cauſe may change: As for example, *Vaſques* teacheth, that the Church did anciently pray in the Maſſe for Infidels alive, and Catecumens dead; and that the Sacrifice of the Maſs offered for them; and yet he holds it but a probable Opinion, and rather inclines to the contrary, that the Sacrifice of the Maſſe ought not to be offer'd but for the Faithfull living and dead; by which Opinion the Church ſeems guided at preſent: But *Vaſques* Anſwer is, that the Church following a probable Opinion did practice

3 p. *diſp.* 228. ch. 3.

practice that which she did not declare to be of Faith, as appears by the contrary practice now in use.

The Church oftentimes (as *Vasques* very well noteth) confirms a Definition by some Testimonies which do not directly prove the Proposition. And yet, when the Fathers in a General Council affirm, that this is gathered from this or that place, this or that Author, who dare say that the Foundation is weak and uncertain?

3 p. *disp.* 182. ch. 9.

Bellarmine (raising an Objection upon the words of *Boniface* the 8th, *Quanquam de censibus*, &c. That the Clergy is exempt from Taxes by Divine right, teacheth the contrary, and answers, that *Boniface* was of the Canonists Opinion, and delivered his sence accord-

Tom. 1 lib. *de Clericis*, ch. 28.

accordingly, but defin'd nothing; for he ſpeaks not by way of definition in a controverted point, but only by way of ſimple aſſertion, and as it were *en paſſant*: The ſame may be affirmed of General Councils; when they mention any thing in this manner and do not properly define; For, as the ſame Author affirmes, it is neceſſary, that General Councils *properly* define the thing in queſtion, as a Decree which ought to be held as of Catholique Faith. Hence *Bellarmin* adds, they are not properly Hereticks, who hold the Pope not to be above all Councils, though he ſay, the laſt *Lateran* Council, under *Leo* the tenth, Seſſ. 11. expreſly and profeſſedly teaches, that the Pope is above all Councils, and rejects the contrary Decree made in the Council of *Baſil*; becauſe 'tis doubtfull whether the *Lateran*

lib. 2. *de Conciliis*, cap. 17.

Council defin'd that Doctrine properly, as a Decree to be believed with Catholique Faith, and ſo they are not properly Hereticks, that maintain the contrary.

The ſame *Bellarmin*, (lib. 2. *of Councils*, c. 19.) alſo requires, that the Definition be made Conciliarly; *P. Martin* the fifth ſaid, he only confirm'd thoſe Decrees of Faith, which were made in the Council of *Conſtance*, *conciliariter*, *i.e.* after the manner of other Councils, the Queſtion being firſt diligently examined: But 'tis clear (ſaies he) that this Decree of a General Council, having immediate Authority from Chriſt, which all, even the Pope are bound to obey, was made without any examining; So that *Martin* confirming all Decrees conciliarly made, intended onely the condemnation of *Wickliff* and *Huſs*.

Hence follows, that the *Depoſitio* or the ordering of Chapters and Ca-

non

nons is not belonging to faith, but only the Canons and Definitions themſelves. *Vaſques* alſo affirms, that all that is taught by the Council, in the Chapters preceding the Canons belonging to Doctrine, (meaning the decreeing, not the introductive part) is of Faith, and the contrary an Error, and he that adheres to it an Heretick.

3 p. *diſp.* 207. c. 3.

II. The Object defined muſt be truly and properly an Object of Faith; ſuch, for example, is not this following Queſtion, *Whether the uſe may be ſeparated from the power in things that are conſum'd by uſe, as bread, &c.* Or any other Queſtion of Law, or Philoſophy; and a Decree ought to be upon a thing univerſally propos'd to the whole Church. According to the ſame Author, it is not at all erroneous to affirm, that a general Council may err in Precepts, and in particular Judgments; and

ch. 25.

having made an Objection, ch. 14. that Pope *Innocent* the 8th had permitted those of *Norway* to celebrate Masse without Wine (which is undoubtedly an Error); He replies, that the said Pope made no Decree, whereby he declared to the whole Church, that it is lawfull to offer Sacrifice without Wine; wherefore he has err'd in fact, but not in Doctrine.

The same Author having ch 4. raised to himself this Objection, That Pope *Stephen* had commanded to reordain those that formerly were ordain'd by the Anti-Pope *Formosus*, and consequently, the judging that the first Ordination was not valid, was an unquestionable Error, *Formosus*, being at least a Bishop, answers thus, Pope *Steven* made no Decree by which he defin'd that those who were ordained by a degraded Bishop, should be reordained, but *de facto* did this in prosecution of his passion or hatred

no

not out of Ignorance or Hereſie.

The ſame Author aſſures ch. 5.
us, that it is no Error to ſay, the Pope or General Council may err in framing Laws, not neceſſary to Salvation, or of things indifferent, or making Superfluous Laws, or under too great a penalty. And moreover, that a General Council may err in particular matters of fact, which depend upon the Teſtimony and Information of men. According to which he adds, that the ſixth General ch. 11.
Council condemned Pope *Honorius* of Hereſie by falſe Information, and by miſunderſtanding the Epiſtles of *Honorius*, for, without all doubt, a General Council may err in a Queſtion of Fact.

I ſhall farther add this particular out of *Suares*. Although the Pope in the grant of an Indulgence declares expreſly, that he is moved thereunto by ſuch a cauſe, which he conceives ſufficient for the foreſaid

Tom. 4. disp. 56. *of Indulg.* Sect. 3. grant; That man would not be thought deficient in faith, that should question the sufficiency of the cause, and consequently the validity of the Indulgence; For this declaration of the Pope doth not at all belong to faith, but to a particular action, depending upon humane prudence, in which the Pope hath no infallible assistance from the Holy Ghost, but onely in what belongs to Faith, according to this Text of S. *Luke*, ch. 22. v. 32. *I have prayed for thee PETER, that thy faith may not fail*: This is prudently noted by *Suares*, according to which it is far from being of Faith, that such or such an Excommunication is valid, or, that such or such a Kingdome is disposeable by the Pope for such or such causes.

I have now ended concerning the general way of separating matters

of

of Faith from all other Doctrines; Let us apply it to our particular controverſies, which we ſhall countenance with the Authority of our moſt renowned modern Doctors, that there may be no doubt of the ſolidity of this *Rule*. And from hence will appear, that the points controverted are much fewer then commonly eſteemed, and the way to an accord more eaſie, which, I hope, will facilitate an Agreement, and Subſcription from our Separatiſts to the undoubted Articles of the *Catholique Church*.

CHAP. 3.

Particular matters: Of *Merit and Inherent Juſtice.*

LEt us now deſcend to particular matters about which our Adverſaries contend with us.

Concerning *Merits*, it is an Article of Faith, That A MAN JUSTIFIED, TRULY DESERVES LIFE EVERLASTING BY HIS GOOD WORKS; For, this is the Definition of the Council of *Trent*; But, as it is not there defin'd, that these *Merits* are *of Justice*, or *of Fidelity*, or *of Condignity*, or *of Congruity*; so, none of all these Particulars are of Faith.

Sess. 6. Can. 32.

lib. 5. of Just. f. 16.

There are (saith *Bellarmine*) 3 Questions among our Schoolmen: The first, If the Merits of the Just ought to be so termed, from *Condignity*, or from *congruity*? The second, If this *Condignity* proceeds from the promise, or from the work? The third, Whether God rewards the works of the Just above, and the works of the Impious below their Condignity? As for the first Question, all Catholicks agree, that

that *the good works of the Just are meritorious of Eternal Life*; but, some would have these Terms of *condignity* and *congruity* laid aside, and rather say, the works of the Just are meritorious of Life Everlasting by the Grace of God. Thus teacheth *Thomas Waldensis*, &c. Others will have the good works of the Just meritorious by *condignity*, but this *condignity* so expounded, as that it rather signifies *congruity*. This opinion is owned by *Durandus*, *Gregorius*, &c. but the most common Opinion amongst Divines admits only a merit of *congruity*. The Opinion of *Durandus* were not to be rejected, if he intended no farther than that our merits are not by Condignity, or absolute Justice, but only presupposing the liberal Promise of God, but, he seems to intend, that our merits, proceeding from the Grace of God, and the Promise presupposed, are not

at all ſuch as that any recompence is due to them by Juſtice, but by the ſole liberality of God; *Vaſques* alſo is of Opinion, that nothing is due by Juſtice, but only by the Promiſe of God.

lib. 2. *diſp.* 115. chap. 1.

As to the ſecond Queſtion, whether our *good works* are meritorious by Condignity in reſpect of the Pact only, or in reſpect of the work only, or in reſpect of the one and the other. There are who hold, that *good works* proceeding from Grace, are not meritorious by Condignity, by reaſon of the work, but in reſpect of the Promiſe, and the Divine acceptation. This is taught by *Scotus*, and divers ancient School-men, and by the Modern Vega. Theſe hold, that the works of the juſt are really and properly good, but that they are not of that excellency as proportionable to Eternal Life, but only as they are accepted of God as a juſt

juſt recompence of Eternal Life, yet ſtill with relation to the pact and promiſe, not to the Dignity of the work. The other opinion ſeems to us more probable, which teacheth, that the good works of the juſt are meritorious of Eternal Life by Condignity, in a joint reſpect of the pact, and the work, for God is not obliged to accept this work, as to ſo great a recompence, if his Covenant did not induce him to it. And here I cannot but note, that *Meſtrezat* did falſly cite the Cardinal, as delivering this Doctrine for an Article of Faith; whereas it is onely produced as an opinion of the Schools.

As to the third Queſtion, whether God Almighty doth not reward good works beyond their Condignity? The affirmative is the conſtant opinion of the Schools: hitherto *Bellarmin.*

What concerns merit for another man,

man, though by congruity, is no Article of Faith, no not the converſion of a ſinner, nor any other favour whatſoever; For the Council propoſeth no ſuch thing, as will hereafter more fully appear.

As for good works in particular, and *in ſpecie*, if you demand which of them are meritorious of Eternal Life? I anſwer, It is not an Article of Faith, that any good work, either of Juſtice, Temperance, Fortitude, Hope, or any other Vertue, (except Charity) are meritorious of Life everlaſting, though proceeding from the grace of God, and done by ſuch as are already in the ſtate of grace. The Proof is certain, for we have not received the contrary by any clear Revelation: Nor does the Council of *Trent* at all meddle with it; and, at the beſt, it is only deducible by conſequence; but (as I ſaid before) we do not build, as upon a certainty, what is gathered

gathered by consequences, though they seem deduced either from Scripture, or from the Decree of a General Council.

Vasques, in this point of *Merit*, saies, the first Opinion is of such who affirm, that those only good works are meritorious, which proceed from the commandment of Charity. This Opinion is taught by *Scotus*, *Gabriel*, *Durandus*, and *Bellarmine* himself, who delivers it as the most frequent Doctrine of the Schools, and yet the Ministers impose upon the Church, as if she taught for an Article of Faith, that Fasting, Mortification, and other exteriour works, or the Monastical Vowes of Chastity, Poverty, and Obedience are meritorious of Eternal Happiness, and that in them consists the Perfection of Sanctity, whereas we consider them onely as the way and means to Charity, which is onely of it self deemed meri-

l. 2. *disp.* 217. chap. 1.

meritorious of Everlasting Life. And here I will conclude all those Books and Writings useless and vain, which impose this Calumny upon the Church.

As for *Justice*, to use the words of the Council of *Trent*, *If any shall say, Men are justified either by the onely Imputation of Christs Justice, or by only Remission of sinnes, excluding Grace and Charity, which by the holy Ghost is poured into their hearts; or, that the Grace whereby we are justified, is only the favour of God*; Anathema. This is the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, but it is not of Faith that this inherent Justice is a habit.

Some Modern Divines (according to *Vasquez*) hold it as a thing already defin'd, though still controverted, to wit, whether the Church hath defin'd it, or, that it belongs to Faith, that the Justice, by

1. 2. *disp.* 203. ch. 2.

by which ſinners are juſtified, be a quality and habit permanent in the ſoul, or whether this Juſtification may be effected as well by the affection of Love towards God, and contrition for ſin? and whether all that is ſaid of our Juſtice in Scriptures, Councils and Fathers, may remain good, if one ſhould affirm, That inherent Juſtice is the affection of the Love of God, and of contrition for ſin. The Title of his 3d *Chap.* is, That it is not defin'd as yet, Whether thoſe that are come to the age of diſcretion are juſtified without the Sacrament, by a habit onely: And in the 6th *Chap.* The Church hath not yet expreſly declar'd, that the juſtification of little children, and of thoſe that are juſtified by attrition onely, and by help of the Sacrament, is done by ſome habit: Hitherto *Vaſques.*

I argue therefore thus, in behalf of our *General Rule of Faith.* Since neither

neither the Council of *Trent*, nor any other General Council do h evidently propoſe this Doctrine to be believed, neither concerning people at the age of Diſcretion, nor Infants baptiſed, nor of Juſtification effected by vertue of the Sacrament, nor, of that done out of the Sacrament, it cannot be eſteemed an Article of Catholique Faith. I do not deny what *Suares* ſaith in proſecution of this, That he conceives, it clearly follows from the definition of the Church, that both little Infants, and thoſe of the age of Diſcretion, who obtain remiſſion of their ſinnes by vertue of the Sacrament, are juſtified by a permanent habit, and quality. But ſince this is only deduced by way of conſequence, drawn from the Propoſal of the Church, 'tis not of Faith; it being probable, That no Doctrine which is not expreſly propoſed by the Church, but drawn by conſequence

quence

quence from her Decrees, is an Article of Faith: To little purpoſe therefore do our Adverſaries conteſt with us about the Doctrine of Habit, ſince, in that they oppoſe not the Church at all.

Hence tis, that *Meſtrezat* (Miniſter of *Charenton*) with ſom'others, hath atteſted the Catholique Faith in the Matter of *Merit* and *Juſtification*, inſtead of oppoſing it, and purely by a miſtake of the ſaid Doctrine, whil'ſt he writes thus in his Diſcourſe of Grace: *We do acknowledge, that good works obtain Eternal Life, onely, we would have it obtained by Benignity, grace, goodneſs, and the mercy of God: and ſo we do not reject the word* (merit) *nor to merit, according to the ſence of the Latin word.* pag. 25.

And moreover we confeſs, we receive the Kingdome of heaven, as a remuneration of our good works, and diſpute only of the nature pag. 28.

nature of this rèmuneration, to wit, if it be of Grace, Bounty, and Mercy, or of rigor of Justice by a condignity of the work. And Again, pag. 7. If you say, that Remuneration is due by rigor of Justice, and by condignity of the work, which is the Tenet of the *Roman* Church, de *Justif.* lib. 5. c. 17. citing *Bellarmin*, how can there be a more gross mistake, then to charge the Church with this, as a Doctrine of Faith, and yet openly to acknowledg as much, or rather more then the Church teacheth in matters of Merit, for the Church holds no more, but that the works of Charity only have for reward Eternal Life: Whereas, *Mestrezat* confesseth the same of all good works in general; and in that saies more then is necessary for a Catholique to say. The same Author pag. 35. speaks thus concerning inherent Justice, *Inherent Justice*

Juſtice, which is the renuing of our ſouls in Sanctity and Chriſtian Vertues, hath a being in our Salvation. And again, Regeneration and Sanctification produce in us inherent Juſtice. God doth not impute inherent Juſtice, but produces it in us. As for his Spirit, it is derived to us by Regeneration, as the habitual corruption of Adam is produced in us by natural generation. pag. 40. pag. 37. Behold our Miniſter here clearly a Catholique, and profeſſing ſomething beyond the Article of Faith: for he teaches, that inherent juſtice is habitual, and doth not only acknowledg it in Charity, but in all other Chriſtian Virtues. And the ſame I have (upon another occaſion) demonſtrated againſt *Teſtard* and *Amirant*. Two *French* Miniſters.

As for our *Satisfactions*, the ſame is to be ſaid, as of *Merits*, to wit, that it is an Article of Faith according

according to the Definition of the Council of *Trent*. *After Justification there sometimes remain some temporal pains to pay, for which we satisfie by Fasting, Prayers, &c.* But it is not of Faith, that by these works we satisfie by way of Condignity or by Justice, or by the rigor of Justice, or by the mercy of God: Nor, that our Satisfactions are properly satisfactory, but rather an application of the satisfactions of Jesus Christ: nor that we can satisfie for the pains due to other mens sinnes, and communicate unto them our Satisfactions. The Reason is, that nothing of all this is propounded as of Faith, by the Council of *Trent*, nor any other General Council, as hereafter more at large will appear.

Sess. 14. can. 12, 13, 14. Sess. 6. can. 30.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Pope.

THat which is contained in our Profeſſion of Faith is by all Catholiques ſubmitted to, as an Article of Faith, *I believe that the Pope of* Rome *is Succeſſor of St.* Peter, *and Vicar of* Jeſus Chriſt *upon earth; I do acknowledg the Holy Catholick Apoſtolique* Roman *Church as Mother and Miſtriſs of all other Churches:* Words taken out of the Council of *Trent*, which Definition agrees with that of *Florence*, and written, and ſigned by the whole Council, after a moſt exact Diſcuſſion of every term by the Greeks, and is as followes, and no more, *We deſine that the Holy Sea Apoſtolique, and the Roman Biſhop is Succeſſor of the B. Peter: Prince of the Apoſtles, and true Vicar of* Jeſus Chriſt, *and head*

Seſſ. 25.

head of the whole Church; Father and Doctor of all the Christians; and that full power hath been given him by our Saviour Jesus Christ, *in the person of B. Peter, to feed, rule, and govern the Universal Church, as it is contained in the Acts of Oecumenical Councils, and in the Holy Canons.*

None of these 3 ensuing Doctrines do at all belong to Faith. 1. That the Pope is infalible in himself, separated from a General Council. 2. That he is above a General Council, and may not be judged by it. 3. That he hath an indirect Authority over the temporal power of Kings. The reason is manifest; for none of these are delivered by any clear Divine Revelation, nor proposed by the Universal Church, as appears by what is above cited out of the Councils of *Trent* and *Florence*, where the Grecians were present, who for a long time op-

posd

pos'd the extent of the Papal power, and did at that time ſift every word in the Definition of the Popes power and Authority, before they ſubſcribed thereunto. And alſo we may well believe, that the Pope and the Weſtern Prelats did not omit to inſert what was due to that Authority, and both the one and the other ſigned no more than what is above mentioned, and agreed, this and only this to be accepted, as belonging to Faith.

Bellarmin, (who to uſe *du Moulins* Phraſe) writes at the Popes feet, and is not wanting to ſet down all the Rights appertaining to that Soveraign Power, in his third Controverſie, which is of the Pope, relates three Opinions currant among Catholiques: 1. That the Pope, as Pope, may be an Heretick, and teach Hereſie, if he define without a General Council. Some *Pariſian* Doctors, as *Gerſon*, *Almanus*, (in

(in their Books of the power of the Church) have maintained this Opinion) as alſo *Alphonſus de Caſtro* againſt Hereſies; and *Adrian* the ſixth, Pope, in the Queſtion of Confirmation; who all place the Judgment of *Infallibility*, in matters of Faith, not in the Pope alone, but in the Church; that is, the Pope, and a General Council. In the ſame place *Bellarmin* rejects the Opinion that holds the Pope cannot be at all an Heretick, nor publickly teach Hereſie, though he ſhould undertake to define alone. The ſame Author confeſſeth, there are many things in the *Decretal Epiſtles*, which do not appertain to matter of Faith, but only declare the Opinion of Popes, upon ſuch and ſuch ſubjects, and than, excuſing *Innocentius* the 8th, for giving way to thoſe of *Norway* to celebrate without wine, ſayes, It was no Decree directed to the whole Church. ch 13.

Hence

Hence I gather, that *Bellarmin* had little reaſon ſo ſeverely to cenſure the Opinion of the *Pariſians*, as to term it erroneous, and ſomewhat approaching Hereſie, ſince the Proofs which he alledgeth to make good his cenſure, taken out of Scriptures, and the Teſtimonies of the holy Fathers, ſpeak abſolutely, and without ſuch Reſtrictions, as *Bellarmine* aſſignes. And our Profeſſion of Faith goes no farther then thus: *I confeſs and acknowledg all things Defined and declared by the holy General Councils, and particularly, by the Council of Trent*; without any Obligation at all to believe things defined by the Popes, even in Provincial Councils.

The Opinion therefore of the *Pariſians* is not in the leaſt erroneus, nor any whit approaching Hereſie, nor oppoſite to the Council of *Trent*; but remains ſtill probable,

and acquits us of that great trouble which *Bellarmin* takes upon himſelf, in excuſing from error as well the Decrees as Anſwers of ſeveral Popes, which are objected in his third Controverſie of the Biſhop of *Rome*.

lib. 4. ch. 8, 9, 10, 11, &c.

As to the ſecond Quere, the ſame *Bellarmin* (in his fourth Controverſie) having put the Queſtion, *Whether the Council be above the Pope?* and ſhewed, that it began, and was debated during the Councils of *Piſa*, *Conſtance*, and *Baſil*, upon occaſion of the great Schiſm produced by ſeveral Pretentions to the Papacy, (a manifeſt ſign that this queſtion was then new) ſaith, This Queſtion continueth even to this day among Catholiques. And a little farther, I finde three ſeveral Opinions of Doctors upon this Subject. The firſt is, That the Council is above the Pope. Thoſe that favour this Opinion

chap. 14.

Opinion are the *Cardinal* of *Cambray*, *Gerſon*, *Almanus*, and ſome others, beſides *Cuſanus*, *Panormitanus*, the *Cardinal* of *Florence*, and *Abuleaſis*: And having firſt cited their ſeveral places, and then explicated them at large, ſaith; Theſe affirm, the Soveraign power Eccleſiaſtical is as well in the Council as in the Pope, but in the Council more immediately, and more immoveably: That it is in the Church to rule and order the Pope, inſomuch that the Church cannot err, but the Pope may; that this ſoveraign power Eccleſiaſtical is beſtow'd upon the Church immediately, and that the Pope being dead, or depoſed or not appearing in Council, the Council is not thereby become an imperfect Body, but perfect, and has ſtill a power to define what is of Faith, and enact Laws, &c. thence they ſeem to deduce this conſequence, *That the Council is above the Pope, and can both judg, and*

puniſh him, and that it is the ſame thing to demand whether the Pope be greater then the Council, or whether a part be greater than the whole? hitherto *Bellarmin.* As to what he ſeems to ſay in his 17th *Chap.* that thoſe who adhere to this opinion cannot be excuſed from great temerity, though they be not properly Hereticques. This cenſure ſeems rather guilty of temerity, than the Opinion cenſur'd, and it is not true which he pretends; That the contrary is taught by the Council of *Florence*, or the laſt of *Lateran*, for neither of them make any mention of it, and the opinion remains ſtill probable as well by the Authority of the Fathers of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, as the Ancient Fathers, for certainly it had been needleſs without this to have aſſembled ſo many General Councils. But the Deciſion of this difficulty is not at all neceſſary to our deſign. It is ſufficient

for

for me to make it apparent, that it is no Article of Faith, nor a Doctrine to which all Christians are bound to submit, since our Doctors are not agreed upon the point, and by application of our *Rule of Faith*, that it is not taught by any General Council.

As for the third Opinion, it is far from being an Article of Faith, to wit, a Doctrine which all Christians are bound to accept, for it is not clearly propos'd by the Universal Church; *Bellarmin* himself (in his Treatise of the Bishop of *Rome*, handling the question of the Popes power *in temporalibus*) affirms, there are three Opinions currant, the first, that the Pope has by Divine right a full power over all the Universe, as well in things Ecclesiastical, as Civil: The second seems to bend to another extremity, and affirms, that the Pope, as Pope, and by Divine right, has no temporal power, and that he can lay no command

upon ſecular Princes, much leſs deprive them of their Kingdomes and Principalities, though in other reſpect they might deſerve a deprivation. The third Opinion ſeems to hold a *medium*, and is moſt frequent among Divines, to wit, That the Pope, as Pope, hath no temporal power directly or immediately, but only ſpiritual; That he hath notwithſtanding a Soveraign power in temporalities, yet only mediate, and in a way to ſpirituality. *Bellarmine* dares not cenſure the ſecond Opinion as erroneous, or near to Hereſie, raſh or improbable, it remains at the leaſt probable; and if ſome Popes have actually deprived ſome Kings and Emperours of their Empires, I anſwer, out of our General Rule of Faith, That the practice of the Univerſal Church in matter of Lawes does not conſtitute an Article of Faith, much leſs ſuch ſingular and individual

Acts

Acts of Popes, which (that they may be freed from blame) it would do well if they could appear grounded upon a probable Opinion.

As to the *Infallibility of the Catholique Church*, our profession of Faith speaks thus; *I receive the holy Scriptures according to that sence and Exposition which the Church hath, and doth hold, to which it belongs to judg of the true sence of the holy Writ.* These words are extracted out of the Council of *Trent*, *Sess.* 4. and it is fit we contain our selves in these terms, and go no farther; wherefore, as the Council abstains from this word *Infallibility*, speaking of the Catholique Church, so it is best to forbear it when we teach what is of Faith, leaving that term to the Schoolmen, as only fit for them, who know how to use it with moderation; for we finde it not in the Holy Writ, nor in the Fathers. Let us consent

our ſelves with the terms of the Council. The matter thus expreſt is moſt certain, *That the Catholick Church never failes in Faith or Manners, by the undoubted aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, which is promiſed, and never fails, and can never fail, becauſe* Jeſus Chriſt, *who hath promiſed it, cannot tell a lie.*

Some ſeem to move another Difficulty; whether (ſuppoſing this aſſiſtance) the Holy Ghoſt be infallible in the Church, or the Church becomes *Infallible* by the aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt? Let us ſend all theſe Subtleties to the Schools, as alſo this other Queſtion, Whether the Scripture be properly the Judg of Controverſie, or the Church, in her General Councils? It is an ordinary ſaying, That the Law judgeth, but experience teacheth, that the Judges perform the buſineſs. God ſpeaking in the Scripture,

is,

is no queſtion the Supreme Judg, but when particular men raiſe debates concerning the ſence of this or that place of Scripture, the Prelates in General Councils muſt determine which is the true ſence of the Propoſition then in debate; Wherefore let us adhere to the words of the Council of *Trent*, and of our Profeſſion of Faith before cited, by which we ſhall be ſufficiently guided, leaving the reſt to the deciſion of the Schools.

There remains now only to take notice what *Blondel* in his great Volume hath ſaid in confirmation both of our Rule and Profeſſion of Faith upon this Subject of the Popes Supremacy, which he pretends to oppoſe, and for want of truly underſtanding the Catholique Doctrine doth notably miſtake to our advantage. And firſt, in his Preface he asketh

A French Miniſter.

pag. 12.

this Question, *What Council or Nation eight hundred year since did believe or attribute to the Pope what those of his party now do? neither that of Florence, nor that of Trent hath dared to define any such thing as they pretend to.* It is sufficient for me, that he undertakes to contest matters that are not contained within the Definitions of General Councils, and that he doth ingenuously acknowledg, that the Councils of *Florence* and *Trent* have not defin'd what the Popes party (as he calls them) seems now to contend for, which are undoubtedly the Opinions above mentioned, and by me already separated from the Doctrine of faith.

pag. ib. *The Roman Sea* (saith the same Author) *claims to it self Infallibility, and an absolute Monarchical power.* And farther,

pag. 830. *The Popes attribute to themselves now adayes the Title of a supreme domineering Authority,*

Authority, and a power erected, totally subduing the members of Christ. Behold both his apparent mistake, and the true cause of his separation from the Catholique Church. Yet more positively in another place he saith, *The Title of the Apostle S. Peter ought* pag. 116.

not to be questioned, since the Greeks and Protestants confess, that it was anciently believed, that he was President and chief of the Apostles, a foundation of the Church, and Possessor of the Keys of the Kingdome of Heaven. And again, *Rome, as the* pag. 107.

Church consecrated by the abode and Martyrdome of S Peter, whom Antiquity hath acknowledged chief of the Apostolique Colledg, having been honoured with the Title of St. Peters Seat; may, without any difficulty be considered even by one of the most renown'd General Councils, to wit, *that of* Calcedon, *as the head.* Herein he clearly acknowledges St.

PETER

PETER, to be head of the Apoſtles, and of the Church, by Divine Right, and the Biſhop of Rome his Succeſſor, of which I have heretofore treated, in anſwer to his great Volumn, or rather produced it as uſefull to our cauſe, wherein he both proves our Tenet learnedly, and confutes the 30th Article of his own Profeſſion of Faith, where it is ſaid, *We believe all true Paſtors in what place ſoever they are, to have equal Authority, under one chief and univerſal Biſhop* Jeſus Chriſt.

pag. 355. As to the difficulty moved, concerning a Judg, *du Moulin* (in his Treatiſe of the Judg of Controverſies) thinks it convenient, that particular men ſhould ſubmit to Councils and Synods, nay, even to National Councils. And moreover, it is pro-

pag. 210. hibited to the Paſtors of Churches, to teach any thing oppoſite to that which is concluded

cluded in the National Synods. To this they are led by the ordinary courſe of reaſon; For otherwiſe (as they confeſs themſelves) There can be neither Peace nor Order in the Church, but a moſt certain and ruinous confuſion. *Daillé* accords more diſtinctly with this Doctrine, in his *Uſe of the holy Fathers*, and ſaies, in the end we muſt refer our ſelves to the Church, provided we know which is the true Church, to whom this reference is due, and if ones aſſurance be revolv'd into the inward perſwaſion of the Holy Ghoſt, which gives a deſcernment of the true from the falſe, who does not ſee, that we both may and ought to believe, that the Holy Ghoſt more powerfully aſſiſts the body of the Church, then particular perſons?

It is certain therefore, both a ready way to an accord, and to prevail with our Separatiſts, if we ſtand faſt to the forementioned termes

terms of our Profeſſion of Faith, and the Council of *Trent*, without adding, diminiſhing, or altering: In which no uſe is made of this word *Infallibility*. And if we ſeparate exactly the Doctrine of Faith contained in theſe terms, from all other opinions, we ſhall eaſily convince thoſe that are now out of the way, to ſubmit to our Profeſſion of Faith, and the Council of *Trent*, which is abundantly ſufficient to make them perfect Catholiques.

CHAP. V.

Of the EUCHARIST.

OUr Profeſſion of Faith according to the Council of *Trent* goes thus, *I confeſs, that in the Bleſſed Sacrament of the Altar there is truly, really, and ſubſtantially the body and blood, as alſo the ſoul and*

and Divinity of our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt; *and, that there is made a mutation of all the ſubſtance of bread into the body, and of all the ſubſtance of wine into bloud, which mutation the Catholique Church calls Tranſubſtantiation.* This is an Article of Faith, and let us be ſure to underſtand it according to the Expoſition of the ſame Council in the ſame Chap. *The holy Synod doth profeſs, that* Jeſus Chriſt, *true God, and true man, is contain'd in the Bleſſed Sacrament of the Euchariſt, after the conſecration of bread and wine, truly, really, and ſubſtantially, under the ſpecies of the ſenſible things; for theſe things are not repugnant in themſelves, that the ſame Saviour be alwayes ſitting at the right hand of his Father, in heaven, according to his natural way of exiſtence, and yet his ſubſtance be preſent ſacramentally in many other places, according to another way of exiſtence; which though we can*

hardly

hardly expreſs by words, yet we may conceive in thought, enlightened by Faith, that it is not impoſſible to God; and this we are bound conſtantly to believe. And farther, in the ſecond Chapter, our Saviour will have it, that this Sacrament be received as the ſpiritual food of our ſoules, by which they muſt be nouriſhed, and comforted, living by the life of him that hath ſaid, *who eateth me, ſhall live for me*: And, as an antidote and defence by which we may be delivered from daily faults, and preſerved from mortal ſins, we may alſo ſay, that *Jeſus Chriſt*, according to his manner of being in the Sacrament, is as a Spirit, and that he is there ſpiritually, that is, according to the nature of a Spirit, *John* 6.63. *The words that I ſpeak to you are ſpirit and life*, without being ſeen, without extention of parts, whole in every part of the Symbols; neither thick, nor big, as

to

to the occupation of place, for ſpirits in their ſubſtances are thus truly ſaid to be in places. In fine, That the body of *Jeſus Chriſt* is here ſpiritual, and not ſenſual; ſince St. *Paul* avers the ſame of our bodies, after the Reſurrection; *It is ſown a ſenſual body, it will riſe a ſpiritual*, 1 Cor. 15. 44. to wit, (according to the Gloſs of *Geneva*) in quality, which ſhall be quite different, and yet the ſubſtance of the body not to periſh. And a little after, *The Later Adam*, which is Jeſus Chriſt, *hath been made into a quickening ſpirit*: Let us add, towards the leſſening of this Controverſie, what we finde ſet down in the 36th Article of our Separatiſts Confeſſion of Faith: *Jeſus Chriſt doth truly feed and nouriſh us with his fleſh and bloud: Moreover, we believe, that by the ſecret and incomprehenſible vertue of his Spirit, he doth nouriſh and give us both life with his body and*

his

his bloud. What difficulty then remains, in caſe they believe the ſubſtance of the body to be preſent for the nouriſhment of their ſoules, to believe alſo, that the ſame ſubſtance is preſent under the ſymbols of bread? for what they object doth equally oppoſe the one and the other; in fine, (they being united with the *Lutherans*, who profeſs to believe this preſence) why will they differ with us upon the ſame Motive?

We ought not at all to enter into the debate of School-queſtions, nor determine univerſally or definitively, whether the onely body of *Chriſt*, according to his natural exiſtence, may be in ſeveral places? or, whether no other body but only the body of Chriſt may have a Sacramental exiſtence, or be a Sacrament? and, whether from hence it followes, that it is the body of God? The main and convincing Reaſon

is,

is, that the Divine Revelation teaches not, nor the Universal Church propoſeth any of theſe to be believed: And it imports not, that ſome of our Doctors ſeem to conclude theſe from Divine Revelation, or, from the propoſal of the Church; for what ſeems to follow from either, is neither Divine Revelation, nor the Propoſal of the Church, and conſequently (according to the general opinion of Divines) no Article of Faith, to which only we are bound to ſubmit. And for the ſame reaſon we ought to be ſilent in theſe Queſtions of *Vaſques*, and other School-men; as, Whether the ſame body may be in many places at the ſame time? or, Whether Chriſt be in the Sacrament, as in a place? or, Whether being there, he may neither be ſeen, nor ſuffer, nor act, *&c.*

As for *Tranſubſtantiation* it ſelf, and that we believe the bread is changed,

changed, converted, and tranſubſtantiated into the body of *Jeſus Chriſt*, it is not (as *Vaſques* noteth very accutely, and proves at large) That the matter of bread begins to be under the form of the body of Chriſt, as the meat is ſaid to be converted into the ſubſtance of what is nouriſhed. Far be it from us to admit any of theſe convertions; and yet our Separatiſts are often perſwaded by their Preachers, that this is our Tenet, which we abhor, for ſo the body of Jeſus Chriſt ſhould be nouriſhed by bread, and conſequently become incorruptible, and both grow and diminiſh, which is repugnant to his immortality. It is not alſo (as the ſame Author obſerves) that in the body of Chriſt is produced ſome accidental quality, or ſome ſubſtantial manner, which is incompatible with the ſubſtance of bread and Wine, yet as a formal cauſe repugnant

pugnant, by which Bread and Wine give over their being or desist to be. Nor, according to the same Author; that the Body of *Jesus Christ* is produced and conserved in the Sacrament by vertue of the words. In fine (sayes the same Author) This *Transubstantiation* is neither a change nor a production of any thing, but it is a relation of order betwixt the substance that doth desist to be; to wit, the Bread and Wine, and that into which it doth desist, or succeeds to it, namely the body and bloud of *Jesus Christ*; or rather (according to the same Author) The Church doth not properly fix her definition; but only such is the force and efficacy of the words, by reason of their signification, that they cause the body and blood of Christ to be present, and by that destroy the substance of bread and wine. And again, such is the signification of the words of

conse-

conſecration. *This is my body*, &c. That by vertue and ſignification of the ſaid words, not only the body and bl oud of *Chriſt* is made preſent under the *ſpecies*, but alſo the ſubſtance of bread and wine give over their being; for the words being inſtituted by Chriſt, and pronounced in his name, and by his Authority, ought to be abſolutely true: but they cannot be true, if they do not render the body and blood of Chriſt preſent under the Species, and deſtroy the being of bread and wine: And the Incompoſſibility of the body and blood with the ſubſtance of bread and wine proceeds from the ſole verity of the words, for they cannot be truly utter'd, except the preſence be made good of the body and blood, and the bread and wine deſtroy'd: Hitherto *Vaſques*.

What difficulty is there at all both to conceive and ſubmit to this Catholique verity, ſo plainly expounded,

pounded, and not to boggle at *Tranſubſtantiation* in ſo clear a ſenſe, it being moſt conformable to reaſon, to believe that God will make good his own words? The difficulty ſeems to conſiſt in this, that ſome expect an alteration, or a change in a natural way, and are willing to underſtand thoſe words in a different ſence from that of the Church, as if our Queſtions concerning faith depended upon mere words, which God forbid. And therefore let us not meddle at all with theſe Queſtions moved by the School-men concerning the eſſence of *Tranſubſtantiation*, to wit, Whether the body of Chriſt may be made preſent in the Bleſſed Sacrament, without a converſion? and whether every thing may be changed into another? Theſe *Queries* ſeem rather to caſt a miſt before our eyes, then at all to clear the difficulty.

The National Synod of Miniſters held at *Charenton* in the year 1631.

and

and *Daillé* with his Colleagues have made a fair overture for an Agreement in this Queſtion: *Daillé* (in his Apology for the Decree of that Synod, declaring their union with the *Lutherans*, who affirm, that the body of our Saviour is truly preſent in the bread of the Euchariſt,) ſaith, This opinion hath no venome in it, nor is prejudicial to piety, or their Salvation: And for theſe reaſons, the Churches of this Kingdom in their National Synod, at *Charenton*, in the year 1631. by an expreſs Act, have received the ſaid *Lutherans* to Communion and Table, notwithſtanding this opinion particular to them, and not held by us. To this I will add a Letter of the ſame Author to one *Monſieur Monglat*. It is a very hard thing, in my opinion, to make that man paſs either for a good Chriſtian, a tolerable Citizen, or a perſon of ſound reaſon, that believing

pag. 72.

believing he many work his Salvation in the Roman Church, will live out of their Communion, or not believe as ſhe doth. From theſe Premiſes I conclude, they are bound to believe the body of our Saviour is truly preſent in the Symbole of the Euchariſt, under pain of being neither eſteemed good Chriſtians, tolerable Citizens, or men of ſound reaſon: and, this being admitted, they ought alſo to believe (under the ſame penalty) *Tranſubſtantiation*, according as we have explicated it, there being nothing to be added, but the abſence of bread, a doctrine in it ſelf of no venome, nor any wayes prejudicial to Salvation. Is not this a fair and eaſie way to an Agreement; which our adverſaries cannot reject, without hazarding ſo great a Cenſure of ſo great a man among them, as *Daillé*.

CHAP. VI.

Of the SACRIFICE of the MASSE.

OUr above mentioned Profession of Faith, extracted from the Council of *Trent* hath these words, *I confess, that in the Mass there is offer'd to God a true, proper, and propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and for the dead.* This is an Article of Faith, and there are also Scholastical and Problematical Questions upon the same Subject; as, Whether this Sacrifice be absolute in it self, or only commemorative of that upon the Cross? These are the terms of *Vasques*, *That the action of Consecration is in that respect only a Sacrifice, or an action of Offering; that, by the body and blood*

Sess. 22. chap. 1, 2, 3.

Jes

Jesus Christ *consecrated and really there contained, is represented the bloody Sacrifice of him that was offered upon the Cross.* I do not say, these words, or this explication is of Faith, but I dare affirm, that to be a Catholique, it is sufficient to believe a proper Sacrifice, whether it be absolute or commemorative; and what difficulty do our Adversaries finde in admitting such a Sacrifice relative or commemorative?

chap. 8. The same *Vasques* teacheth thus; *The reason of the Sacrifice consists formally in the signification of the omnipotency of God, author of life and death.* And chap. 5. again, *All the Essence of the Sacrifice consists in the signification of the death of Christ, which was a bloody Sacrifice, and for that reason is represented not by the consecration of one onely Species, but of both together.* For this reason, I

ſay, the true and entire eſſence of this Sacrifice conſiſts in the Conſecration not of one only, but of both *ſpecies*. Yet an abſolute Sacrifice (to wit, not commemorative of another) requires ſome change of the the thing offer'd; And yet this change is not the formal reaſon of the Sacrifice, for that conſiſts in the ſignification of the omnipotency of God, author of life and death. And therefore, if there be found an Oblation, by which without a true and real change of the thing offer'd, God may be acknowledg'd and honour'd as Author of life and death, it ought truly and properly to be termed a Sacriſice; But ſuch is the conſecration of the body and blood of Chriſt, without a real change of Chriſt himſelf, by reaſon of the only repreſentation of his death; this therefore ſhall truly and properly be a Sacrifice: And it is manifeſt, that by the only repreſentation

ſentation of the death of *Chriſt* in the conſecration is as well ſignified, that God is the Author of life and death, as by the bloody death of Chriſt upon the Croſs; And according to this we have ſaid heretofore, that there is not required to the Eſſence of a Sacrifice in general any change of the thing offer'd, for the commemorative Sacrifice may have a being without it, though it be neceſſary for the eſſence of an abſolute Sacrifice; becauſe, The formal reaſon of a Sacrifice, which conſiſts in ſignification, not by words, but by the things themſelves, by which God is ſignified Author of life and death, is found in the commemorative Sacrifice without any ſuch change.

But we muſt note, that it would not be ſufficient for a commemorative Sacrifice to be truly and properly termed a Sacrifice, if it were only a ſimple ſigne of the

death of any thing, not containing the thing it ſelf, whoſe death is repreſented; for by that means the thing it ſelf whoſe death is repreſented ſhould not be ſaid to be offer'd in Sacrifice, nor be truly a commemorative Sacrifice, but rather a ſign or bare token of a Sacrifice; But it is neceſſarily requir'd, that the thing it ſelf, whoſe death is repreſented, be a ſign of its own death. Since then *Chriſt* himſelf is under the *ſpecies* of bread and wine, and the action of the Prieſt in offering them, doth ſo much concern him, that he himſelf, being repreſented by the *ſpecies* of bread and wine, doth repreſent in a particular manner (according to which he is conſecrated by the Prieſt) the bloody and real death of himſelf, and that by this repreſentation he declares, that God is the Author of life and death: Though he be not ſaid to be kil'd and dye truly and in effect,

effect, but in figure and resemblance only, notwithstanding he is said to be truly offer'd in Sacrifice, and immolated in effect; what difficulty is there in admitting a commemorative Sacrifice in this sence?

As to this word, *propitiatory Sacrifice* it is an Article of Faith, as I said before, but not that it is propitiatory as the Sacrifice of the Cross, or the Redemption of humane kind, for the Merit of the Sacrifice of the Cross (according to the same *Vasques*) was of an infinite value more then sufficient for our Redemption, and therefore there is no necessity of any other immolation or Sacrifice, or of a reiteration of the same, either in the same manner or any other, whereby *Christ* should merit the grace of our Redemption: And *St. Paul* (*Heb.* 9. 10.) speaks in the same sence, for in this unbloody Sacrifice *Christ* doth not merit, but his

disp. 221. *chap.* 4.

his will was, that as well by this as by the Sacrament, the fruit of his universal Merit might be applyed to us. Conformable to which the Council of *Trent* teaches, that Christ hath left in his Church this Sacrifice that the bloody one which was once performed upon the Cross may be represented, and the Soveraign vertue thereof applyed to the remission of those sinnes we daily commit. Here it is defin'd, that the Sacrifice is a particular means whereby to ayply the fruit and merit of the passion of *Christ*. And what *Calvin* sayes, that it is superfluous for the application of the fruit of the Cross, since there are divers other wayes by which it may be applyed, is a most frivolous Objection; for by the same reason he may prove, that Baptism, and their communion (as they celebrate it) are superfluous, since there are other

Sess. 22. c. 1.

other means by which the merit of the passion of *Christ* may be applyed, as by the Preaching of the Word, &c.

But I wonder what prejudice the Church receives by various applications of that merit? The same *Vasques* (having cited the Opinions of some Authors, who say, That not only the venial, but mortal sinnes for whom this Sacrifice is offer'd are blotted out thereby, as by the Sacrament of *Penance*, meaning that it is sufficient for that effect, that he for whom it is offer'd have only *Attrition*, and that by the efficacy of this Sacrifice, as well as the Sacrament of Penance, the grace of Remission of sinnes is immediately confer'd without any other affection of the will) confutes these Opinions, and proves (in his 2d and 3d *Chap.*) That this Sacrifice hath no force at all for the re-

disp. 128. chap. 1.

mitting of mortal ſinnes, nor even for venial, nor ſo much as to augment grace and Juſtification, as is perform'd by the Sacrament of Penance, but only to implore the help of Grace, and the ſpirit of Repentance and *Contrition*, by which our ſinnes are truly forgiven, or to procure ſuch holy inclinations by which a man may augment his Juſtification; Inſomuch that this Sacrifice of the Maſs is in ſome ſort leſs propitiatory than the Sacraments, and leſs than *Contrition*, ſince by the one and the other immediately ſinnes are forgiven.

Moreover *Vaſques* teacheth and proves at large, that *Contrition* alone purgeth from mortal ſin, and conſequently, that it is of it ſelf propitiatory, and in that regard much more *formally*, than this our Sacrifice, which is propitiatory onely by way of impetration. In the ſame manner are alſo Acts of Faith and Prayer

prayer propitiatory; And therefore I wonder where the difficulty lyes in receiving this our Sacrifice of the Mass as propitiatory, since the same is attributed to acts of Faith, acts of Contrition, and receiving the Blessed Sacrament. Insomuch that I conclude (the misunderstanding of the Question being removed the way to an accord is very easie.

CHAP. VII.

Of the *ADORATION* of the *Eucharist*.

Sess. 13. can. 11. THE Council of *Trent* runs thus, *If any one sayes, that* Jesus Christ, *the only Son of God ought not to be adored with the exterior worship of* Latria *in the Blessed Sacrament*

of the Euchariſt, and for that reaſon, that it ought not to be publickly expos'd to the people to be adored, and that they who adore it are Idolaters, Anathema. This is therefore an Article of Faith according to our Rule, ſince it is propos'd by the Univerſal Church, and it is ſufficient, to be a Catholick in this point, to receive it in this ſence only, according to the farther explanation of the foreſaid Council, *chap.* 5. And as we honour a man apparel'd, without requiring him to put off his cloathes, even in the ſame manner as if he were not veſted: So we adore *Jeſus Chriſt* under theſe Symbols or ſignes, as if he were not veſted in them, and it is one and the ſame honour, not two ſorts of Adoration which ſomtimes we call the Adoration of Chriſt, and the Adoration of the Bleſſed Sacrament, for by the B. Sacrament the Council underſtands *Jeſus Chriſt* thus veſted,

veſted, and under theſe ſignes, and the Adoration of the B. Sacrament, the Adoration of *Jeſus Chriſt* in this Veſture. This is moſt evident, for it adds, that the worſhip *Latra* (which is due to God alone) is given to this B. Sacrament, and every man knows this manner of worſhip is due to none but God, whatſoever may belong to the relative *in abſtracto*; of which more hereafter.

On the contrary, it is not a point of Faith, that the reverence we give to the Symbols or ſignes is *Latria*, but rather ſome inferiour worſhip, as when we kiſs the garment of a perſon of quality, yet it is a hard matter even for a Courtier punctually to define what that Reverence is, though our Separatiſts will needs engage us in this tickle Queſtion. There is no Catholick (ſaies *Bellarmin* upon this ſubject) teacheth that the exteriour ſignes ought of themſelves lib. 4. c. 29.

themſelves to be adored with the worſhip *Latria*, but only reverenced by ſome inferior worſhip which is agreeable to all the Sacraments. The Miniſters themſelves, in their book of Diſcipline, give order that men be uncovered during the celebration of the Sacraments. There are ſeveral Opinions (ſayes *Vaſques*) concerning the Reverence due to the *ſpecies* of the B. Sacrament; ſome ſay the *ſpecies* may be honor'd in themſelves by a proper worſhip, as many hold concerning pictures, and the name of *Jeſus*, but I finde little weight in this Opinion, becauſe the ſacramental *ſpecies* are inanimated things, and of themſelves incapable of honour and reverence, excepting in the quality of being joyn'd with Chriſt, and containing him; wherefore *Cajetan* ſaies very well, That in the Bleſſed Sacrament

ch. 10. art. 2.

3 p. *diſp.* 108. chap. 12.

Sacrament we adore not the accidents at all, but *Christ* contained in them, and that the Adoration, which tends to Christ, determines only by accident in the *species*.

Hence will appear how unjustly the *French* Ministers (in their Apology for the union made in their National Synod held at *Charenton* the year 1631. with the *Lutherans*) object (as the chief cause of their separation) the Adoration of the Eucharist believed and practised in the Church of Rome. I intend here to confute *Daillé* out of *Daillé* himself.

There is a large difference (sayes he in his Letter to *Monsieur Monglat*, pag. 6. explicating the 9th *chap.* of their Apology) *betwixt these two Adorations, the first, That we ought to adore the body of Christ in the Eucharist: the second, That we ought to adore the Eucharist it self. The later is directed to a certain*

certain object subsisting in the place where it is, to wit, to the substance vail'd with the accidents of bread and wine, insomuch as presupposing that substance to be a creature, the adoration we give it must of necessity be an unlawfull duty forbidden by God, though the former seems only vain and unprofitable, and falls of it self to nothing, the abuse consisting in this. Not that the address is made to an object, which is not adorable as is the other, but in this only, that by error and mistake it is sought and thought to be where it is not: Hitherto *Daillé*. This latter adoration (as the pretended principal cause of their separation rather from us than the *Lutherans*) is falsely imputed to us, and will appear a meer calumny. But the importance of the matter being great, and because it is assigned as the foundation of their separation particularly from the *Roman* Catholicks, prevailed with

with me to addreſs my ſelf to the Doctors of the faculty of Divinity in the Univerſity of *Paris*, requeſting an anſwer to the caſe thus ſtated.

The Doctors are humbly deſired to deliver their Opinion, whether the fact contained in the 36th Page of *Monſieur Daillé* his Letter to Mr. *Monglat* be true or falſe.

The Doctors (whoſe names are under-written) of the faculty of Divinity in the Univerſity of *Paris* anſwer, *That the fact is falſe, and falſly impos'd upon the Catholique Church, which (adoring the holy Euchariſt) does not believe any other ſubſtance vail'd under the accidents of bread and wine to be ador'd but* Jeſus Chriſt; *anathematizing all thoſe that adore any other ſubſtance whatſoever. And it is alſo falſly ſuppos'd by the Author, that there is more danger in the adoration of the*

Catholique

Catholique, than of the Lutheran, *because the Catholique addresseth his Adoration to an object that is not adorable, and by that means his worship becomes unlawfull and forbidden by God. It being most undoubtedly true, that the object which the Catholique adores is* Jesus Christ, *adorable wheresoever he is. And thus the Eucharist (in which the Catholique Church acknowledges no other substance after the Consecration but that of* Christ) *is only adored, and nothing else to be adored. And though by inconsideration or any other accident, instead of the Eucharist an unconsecrated bread should be exposed to the people, the Catholique neither believes any adoration due, nor intends any adoration to it, but only to the substance of* Jesus Christ.

Apr. 18. 1643. Signed in the Original
Jaques Hennequin; *Emmer*
Pererret; *Du Fresne de Mi*
Chapelas; *M. Cantat*. *Brou*
Judas; *A. de Machy*.

In fine (to cut the Queſtion ſhort) the Council of *Trent* obliges us no farther then to adore *Jeſus Chriſt* in the Euchariſt ; therefore our adoration cannot be in it ſelf unjuſt, nor a juſt cauſe to *Daillé* of ſeparation, who in the ſaid Apology goes on, ſaying, *That the Church of* Rome *commands all thoſe of her communion to render that ſoveraign worſhip, which ſhe calls* Latria, *and which ſhe confeſſeth due to God alone, to the bread of the Euchariſt (But in the Euchariſt there is no ſubſtance of bread, but of* Jeſus Chriſt *himſelf, according to St.* John 6. 51.) *ſince they hold this Sacrament for their great God : (underſtanding alwayes* Jeſus Chriſt *under theſe Symbols or ſignes) for he is there hidden and in myſtery according to the Greek word, which is in Latine* Sacramentum. *And as Chriſt in himſelf is termed a Sacrament, ſo we ſay, the Sacrament of the Incarnation, for*

Chriſt

Christ incarnate, and in the same manner the Sacrament of the Eucharist, Jesus Christ *being really in the Eucharist*; And therefore in this sence and no other, according to the Council of *Trent*, we adore, with absolute *Latria*, due to God alone, this most holy Sacrament.

Here is no news among us of two Adorations, nor any difference concerning the Adorations which *Daillé* seems to fancy; The first, of adoring the body of Christ in the Eucharist; the other, of adoring the Eucharist it self: They are not, according to our Principles, two, but one and the same signified in divers terms, as the Incarnation, and Sacrament of the Incarnation are not different, but only in the variety of expression: wherefore *Daillé* is much mistaken in the whole business, as well as in citing thus the Council of *Trent*. The Church of *Rome* will that

Sess. 13. c. 5. pag. 66.

that we give the Euchariſt an Adoration, not mediate, but immediate; not relative, but abſolute. Theſe things he repeats very often, as alſo his own miſtakes of our Doctrine, which compoſe the principal and greateſt part of his Apology; for, beſides that the Council of *Trent* is free from this imputation, there is not any Doctor teaches, that *Latria* ought to be given to the *ſpecies* of the Sacrament, but to *Jeſus Chriſt* himſelf, the other being an Idolatry beyond that of the Pagans. In fine, he fights with his own ſhadow, and I willingly admit of all his Arguments from the 8th to the 18th Chapter, againſt ſuch Adorations as are only grounded upon his own miſtake: What quality and manner of worſhip belongs to the *ſpecies*, relative, ſecondary, &c. our School-men have decided in their opinions. Wherefore we conſider them only as Problematical

Queſtions

Questions and not belonging to Faith; since the Council is silent in them, and consequently they can give no just cause of Separation.

pag. 376. 340. *Dailé* confesseth in his Treatise of *Images*, that there is a degree of respect and honor due to the Instruments of Religion, as *Chalices*, the sacred Books, the water of Baptism, the bread and wine of the *Cene*, &c. And therefore we shall press him no farther, nor enquire any other worship to the Species of the Sacrament, but what he willingly grants, and only put him in minde of what he saies in the same Apology: *the subject, which they name the Sacrament of the Eucharist, be in its substance, the body of Christ (as they of the* Roman *Church hold) it is evident, they may and ought to adore it, it being most certain, that the body of Christ is a subject adorable.*

I conclude therefore, that the forementioned Objection of *Daillé* being of no weight at all can afford no juſt cauſe of ſeparation, and conſequently, that the difficulty concerning Adoration is at an end, and ought both to be believed and practis'd, under pain of being eſteemed neither good Chriſtians, tolerable Citizens, nor men of ſound reaſon.

CHAP. VIII.

Of the HONOR *due to Saints.*

I BELIEVE, THAT THE SAINTS, WHICH RAIGN IN HEAVEN WITH CHRIST, ARE TO BE VENERATED: Theſe are the words of our Profeſſion of Faith; and the ſame is taught by the Council of *Trent*, and conſequently is an Article of Faith, which

which ought not to be controverted, for if we honour Saints upon earth, which are the faithfull, why ſhould not we honour thoſe who are endowed with a ſanctity more ſublime and certain than the others?

But it is not of Faith that the honour we give our B. Lady, or the Angels, *&c.* is a *religious* honour, for the Church doth not determine it, and our Doctors are of different Opinions, which *Vaſques* argues at large. The firſt Opinion is, (ſaith he) That it is one and the ſame vertue in effect, *Latria*, due to God alone, and *Doulia* to the Saints, but the more probable opinion is, that *Doulia* is a diſtinct vertue from *Latria*, by which we honour the Saints; and that Religion and *Latria* being the ſame thing, belong to the worſhip of God alone. Theſe ſay, the Veneration of Saints appertains to another vertue, and that it is not properly

3 p. *diſp.* 98.

properly an act of Religion, but a vertue by which honor is given to Saints, and to all persons in an eminent civil dignity.

The Doctors are not well agreed in this point. S. *Bonaventure* with some others distinguishes the vertue of *Doulia* from that of *Latria*, and does not subdivide *Doulia*, but leavs it indifferent as well to persons in authority as to Saints; and, interposing his own opinion, sayes, We may well affirm it is one and the same vertue, whatsoever we call it, whether *Observance* or *Doulia*, by which we pay the honor due to Eminent persons, and such as are constituted in Dignity, as Dukes, Governors, Senators, Priests, and Saints. For since the cause of the Reverence we give is Excellency or Dignity created, there can be no diversity of causes for the practice of the vertue: yet I easily assent, that there is a special habit

of vertue, by which we honour Saints, and Prieſts, by reaſon the Dignity, moving us to worſhip or Reverence them, is of a ſuperiour nature to that of a civil reſpect.

Let us call this honour due to Saints, civil, or Religious, as they pleaſe, ſince to be a Catholique it is ſufficient that we honour thoſe in heaven upon an equal title with the Saints on earth, and Prieſts. Who is it then that can condemn this honour? It muſt needs be a miſtake, or miſunderſtanding of our Doctrine that gives our Separatiſts this pretence of difference. The Council of *Trent* giving no particular name to this honor, leavs us at liberty to call it what we pleaſe; and I cannot conclude better then with the ſaying of *Drelincourt*, a Miniſter of *France*, as well in his later Treatiſe of the quality of the honour given by them to the Mother of God, as in his anſwer to *P. Hautin* the

the Jesuit; These are his words, *Having my intention wholly bent upon the peace and concord among Christians, I have endeavour'd to reconcile, with a spirit of sweetness and Charity, the difference that is betwixt us and those of the* Roman *Church, concerning the honor which is due to the holy and blessed Virgin* Mary, *and that it may appear, we are not persons that oblige our selves scrupulously to words, I have made no difficulty to avow, that the honor due to her may in some manner be termed a religious honor.*

Thus you see in this Point our Separatists are inclined to teach as much or more then in rigor is required at their hands.

CHAP. IX.

Of the *INVOCATION* of *SAINTS.*

OUr Profession of Faith teaches thus: I HOLD CONSTANTLY, THAT THE SAINTS, WHO REIGN IN HEAVEN WITH JESUS CHRIST, ARE TO BE INVOCATED: Words extracted out of the Council of *Trent*, which explicates the same more at large in these terms following: *It is good and profitable to call upon the Saints, and to have recourse to their Prayers, aid, and assistance, whereby to obtain from God many benefits, by the merits of his Son* Jesus Christ, *who is our Redeemer and Saviour.* This is an Article of Faith, and the Church

Sess. 25.

Church propoſeth it to our belief.

Though it is moſt certain, that the Cannoniz'd Saints (which we call upon) are Saints, ſince the Church aſſiſted by the Holy Ghoſt (after a diligent and exact enquiry of their lives and miracles, done as well during their abode in this world, as after their death) propoſeth them to us as ſuch; yet our *Rule of Faith* which we conſtantly adhere to, doth not deliver for an Article of Faith, that the Cannoniz'd Saints (*verbi gratia*) St. *Francis*, St. *Baſil*, &c. are Saints, or even the Apoſtles themſelves; for nothing is of Faith, but what God has revealed to the Prophets and Apoſtles, propos'd by the Univerſal Church: But God has not reveal'd to them that St. *Francis*, for example, liv'd ſaintly, wrought miracles, is in heaven, no not ſo much as that he ever was in the world; It is therefore no Article of Faith; and beſides, it depends upon

Queſtions of Fact, and of thoſe Informations and Teſtimonies that are taken before the Cannonization, which is far from being a Revelation made to the Prophets and Apoſtles, *&c.* and in which the Church may be miſ-led by falſe Informations, as I hinted before out of *Bellarmin* and other Doctors. And to this I adde, that theſe Cannonizations are only performed by the Pope, and thoſe entruſted by him, and that the whole Church, neither in the Council of *Trent*, nor any other General Council, hath propos'd or taught that S. *Francis* liv'd holily, and is now in heaven. The thing of it ſelf is moſt certain, as ſupported by the moſt ſolid and undoubted Proofs imaginable; and that perſon juſtly to be cenſur'd who ſhould call it in queſtion; yet is it demonſtrable by our Principles to be no Article of Faith.

It is a matter very conſiderable, that the Council of *Trent* (one of

of the moſt learned that ever was in the Church, and where appeared a very great number of moſt Eminent Divines, as well School-men as others) ſhould propoſe poſitively unto us. *That it is good and profitable humbly to call upon the Saints, and to have recourſe to their interceſſion,* and yet not to propoſe unto us, that they hear our Prayers. If the Council had deem'd it an Article of Faith, why did it not teach it, as well as define, *That it was good and profitable to call upon them?* In the latter the Council is ſilent, contenting it ſelf with the former Definition. And therefore when we go about to reclaim thoſe that are out of the way, we ought alſo to be ſilent in this point. But ſince from hence in expreſs terms we cannot diſcover it to be of Faith, we may conclude ſtrongly from the ſilence of this learned Council, that it is not of obligation to be believed.

It seems truly to follow from the Invocation which the Church hath alwayes believed, and practised towards Saints raigning with *Jesus Christ*, and that see him face to face (as I shall explicate more at large hereafter.) But, as many of our Doctors are of opinion, that what follows from Scripture is not an Article of Faith, because not expresly revealed; so, that which follows from the proposal of the Church, is not the express proposal of the Church, and consequently no Article of Faith; that is, to which every one is bound to subscribe under pain of Heresie.

Tom. 1. *cont.* 7. lib. 1. ch. 2. *Bellarmin* affirms this consequence to be good: *The Saints are justly call'd upon, therefore they know what we demand*; and they are not call'd upon in vain; and though we should grant they do not hear our Prayers, yet it is supplyed by

by ſome other way. For, as we do not in vain preſent our requeſts to the King, though we know he does not read them; as for example, in the Minority of Kings, yet Petitions are addreſt unto him, and who dare blame the practice? yet ſome others appointed for that ſervice do perform it, and the Petitioners obtain their Requeſts, as if the King himſelf had perus'd them. Certainly St. *Auſtin* (in his Book *De cura pro mortuis*, cap. 26. ſpeaks thus doubtfully: *This Queſtion exceeds the reach of my judgment, How the Martyrs relieve thoſe who are certainly aſſiſted by them? whether they are preſent by themſelvs at the ſame time in ſo many ſeveral places where the benefit of their ſuccour is received? or being retired from the converſation of men in ſome place proportionated to their merits, and there interceding for the relief of thoſe that call upon them, as we pray*

for the dead who are not really present with them, and know not how they are, nor what they doe; God Omnipotent, and ever present, hearing the Prayers of the Martyrs, grants to men by the Ministry of Angels those helps, which are sutable to the merits of the Martyrs, where he will, when he will, and as he pleaseth, This is too high and hidden for me to define: But *Bellarmin* adds very well, *Although we may doubt in what manner the Saints and Angels know things absent, and our Prayers; yet it is certain they know them, in that they are over us, and have care of our affairs; and it belongs to their perfect beatitude to know the things that concern them, and principally such as belong to their honor and glory.*

Do not the Devils appear, and assist Witches and Sorcerers when they are call'd upon, and will our Separatists deny the like to the Saints?

Saints? Let them alſo deny it to the humanity of *Jeſus Chriſt* in heaven, and demand with *Calvin*, whether it hath ears long enough to reach ſo far, and eyes ſo ſharp-ſighted as to view our neceſſities? For, in the ſame manner, as that holy ſoul of *Jeſus Chriſt* hears our Prayers in heaven; ſo do the Saints, ſeeing the Divinity face to face, in which all things are contain'd; ſince in that holy Inheritance (as St. *Gregory* calls it) all ſee God by a common light: And who can be ignorant of any thing, who know him that knows all? This is an eaſie way to conceive how the ſoul of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and the Saints both ſee and know, in God, our Prayers. As to what St. *Auſtin* and ſome others have doubted, or rather (according to *Suares*) thought that the Saints and thoſe other ſouls ſufficiently purged were not ſo ſoon received into beatitude, but were

even

even to the day of Judgment confin'd to ſome place, where they did not enjoy the beatifical Viſion: It is no wonder at all that the ſame St. *Auſtin* doubted whether the Saints deceaſed heard our prayers: But the Church, in the Council of *Florence*, hath taught in her Definition, *That the ſouls of the dead, as ſoon as cleanſed from all ſin, are receaved into heaven, and ſee clearly God, as he is in himſelf.*

This being ſuppoſed, which imports that what is ſaid in St. *Matth.* 22. *v.* 30. is from that time verified of them, *They are as the Angels of God in heaven*: and it ſeems to me, that this hearing of our Prayers is very clear in Scripture, and particularly in St. *Matth.* 18. 10. *See you deſpiſe not one of theſe little ones, for I ſay unto you, their Angels in heaven alwayes ſee the face of my Father which is in heaven.* And St. *Luke* 15. 7. *There ſhall be joy in heaven*

upon

upon one ſinner that doth penance. The Saints therefore hear our prayers, as the Angels ſee the contempt of one of thoſe Little ones, or as thoſe in heaven ſee the Repentance of a ſinner. What difficulty is there at all, that a Spirit ſhould hear and know, as ſpirits hear and know? For in the face of God all is clearly ſeen and known, as St. *Gregory* witneſſeth. And as the ſoul of *Jeſus Chriſt* contemplates all that relate unto it, that is, all things in general; ſo do the Saints that which concerns them, as in particular the Prayers that are addreſt unto them: For confirmation of this truth, many Teſtimonies of the Fathers may be alledged, which ſhall be hereafter performed, and the conſent of Authors, ſince the Definition of the Council of *Florence*. And notwithſtanding all this, I do not infer, that this conſequence is neceſſary, *They are to*

be

be invoked, therefore they hear our Prayers. St. *Austin* and others held the one, and yet doubted of the other; but supposing they see God face to face, the difficulty is not great, and the Consequence from the Invocation of Saints to this, That they hear our Prayers, is easily maintainable, in this sence wherein I deliver it: From these Premisses ensues a fair way to an Agreement; for the modern Separatists, or at least most of them hold, That the Saints are happy in heaven, and see God face to face, before the Resurrection, and are willing to perswade themselves, that from hence they go directly to heaven, and enjoy a perfect Felicity. *Du Moulin* sayes, We tend to the Beatitude of the Saints that are in glory, and it is false that we believe the Angels and Saints ignorant of our Necessities. Though their

Bucler of Faith and Evasions.

their Father *Calvin* taught them no such Doctrine in his *Institutions*, writing thus; *Many trouble themselves disputing in what place souls are detained, or whether they already enjoy the glory promised for ever. It is a folly and temerity to enquire after these unknown and high Mysteries, which God hath not imparted to us.* And a little after, *The souls of the Faithfull having ended their term of combate and work, are received to rest, where they expect the fruition of Glory promised, and so all things remain in suspence until the coming of our Saviour* JESUS CHRIST. lib. 1. c. 25. Sect. 6.

'Tis true, our Separatists change their Doctrine as they please, but the latter Opinion, *That the Saints and Faithfull see God face to face*, is now currant, and will somewhat facilitate this point, That the Saints in heaven hear our Prayers. And though

though they ſhould not aſſent to this, they ought not to reject what the Council of *Trent* propoſeth, *That it is good and profitable, humbly to call upon the Saints, and have recourſe to their Interceſſion*; for St. *Auſtin*, and thoſe other Fathers have called upon them, though doubting whether they heard them or no? And I dare affirm, our Separatiſts neither out of Scripture, nor by any other ſufficient proof can ſhow, that in caſe they do not hear us, that yet it is not good and profitable to have recourſe to them; for the contrary is apparent by what I ſaid before, and by the example of the Kings minority, where we both render him the honor that is due, and obtain our Requeſts. The ſame is evident in the invocation of Saints. And therefore I wonder what ſhould hinder our Separatiſts from ſubſcribing to it: And if we content our ſelves to teach the one without

inſiſting

insisting upon the other, we shall do no more than what the Council of *Trent* by her silence hath given us an example of.

But since we have made it so easie, that seeing God face to face they cannot but know our necessities, and hear our Prayers, and since we beg the Prayers of the Faithfull here upon earth, we may well conclude, it is very expedient to have recourse to those that are in a more sublime and safe condition of Sanctity, to whom the sight of God reveals what is necessary both for them to know, and us to receive.

Of

CHAP. X.

Of the HONOR given to IMAGES.

Our Profession of Faith saith thus, and no more; I FIRMLY AVOW, THAT THE PICTURES OR IMAGES OF *JESUS CHRIST*, OF THE BLESSED MOTHER OF GOD ALWAYES A VIRGIN, AND OF OTHER SAINTS, OUGHT TO BE KEPT AND RESERVED, AND THAT HONOUR AND VENERATION IS DUE UNTO THEM; AND ALSO, THAT THEIR RELIQUES OUGHT TO BE REVERENCED: Words taken ought of the Council of

of *Trent*: which more distinctly expresseth it self thus. *Not that we believe there is in them any Divinity or vertue for which they ought to be honour'd, or that we ought to ask any thing of them, or place any confidence in the said pictures; but because the honor we give them is refer'd to the Prototype, or thing represented; insomuch that by the Pictures we kiss, or before which we kneel, or put off our hats, we adore Christ, and reverence the Saints, whom these Pictures represent.* This is an Article of Faith, in the performance whereof we do no more than what Ministers ordain in their Discipline: *Let all be uncover'd when the Psalms are sung, as well in the beginning as end of the Sermon, and during the celebration of the Sacraments*: no more than they practise towards the Elements of their *Cene* (which according

Sess. 25.

ch. 10. Art 2.

according to them is onely a figure or ſign, which differs little from an Image.) And Laſtly, no more than they give to Baptiſm, and to the words of the Pſalms.

Many Opinions relating to this ſubject, are not of Faith, no more than the Problematical Queſtions of the Schools. As for the Prototypes of Images, the Council mentions none but of *Chriſt*, of the B. Virgin *Mary*, and of the Saints, abſtaining to ſpeak of thoſe expreſſions of the Trinity, and of God according to his Divine Nature. Some Catholique Authors produced by *Vaſques*, to wit, *Henricus*, *Abulenſis*, *Durandus*, and *Martinus de Avila*, ſay, it is not any wayes lawfull to frame Pictures of the Trinity, but only of God in his humanity: The other opinion, though it be not ſo certain, as that we may avow it as a Doctrine of Faith,

3 p. diſp. 163. chap. 3.

Faith, ſeems to me, ſaith he, more probable, and it cannot be deny'd without ſome temerity againſt the common uſe of the Church, That it is not unlawfull in it ſelf to paint the Trinity; which he proves amply, and confirms by the frequent uſe of the Church, as well at *Rome* as other places, where Pictures of the Trinity are often expos'd to the Reverence of the people: But the Council of *Trent* has determin'd nothing in the afore-cited place; only commands, that if at any time the Hiſtory of the holy Writ be painted (intending thoſe where God is to be repreſented) that great care be taken to explicate it ſo well to the people, as that they may underſtand, that the Divinity of it ſelf is inviſible to the eyes of the body, and that this is only an expreſſion of ſome Apparition or other Action of God, ſutable to our humane conception.

It is a great Queſtion, whether

God

God did forbid the Jews all use of Images or no? *Many famous Authors*, saith *Vasques*, (which opinion seems very probable to me) *affirm, that all use whatsoever of Images or Statues were forbidden the Jews, by the positive Precept of God, besides the Adoration of the Gentiles, which was forbidden formerly by the Law of Nature: As for the Cherubins of the Ark, they were only placed by way of ornament, not expos'd as the object of Worship: and truly there was no Reverence at all given them by the Jews, as far as we can understand, it being only esteem'd a ceremonial Precept.* And the Council of *Trent* sayes nothing against this.

Disp. 104. chap. 2.

As for the honor given to *Pictures* we must observe, that neither our profession of Faith, nor the Council of *Trent* make any mention at all of adoring the pictures of Christ, much

much leſs thoſe of the Saints: And whether this honor may be termed Adoration or no, is a Queſtion in the Schools, and a Queſtion rather of the name than the thing. The Common-people now adaies, for anciently it had a larger ſignification, uſually underſtand by this word (*Adoration*) abſolute *Latria*, and to adore a Picture in this ſenſe is no leſs then Blaſphemy; inſomuch as when we ſay, we adore the Croſs, it muſt be in the ſence the Council defines and allowes, that by it and the Images repreſenting *Jeſus Chriſt*, which we kiſs, and before which we kneel, we adore *Jeſus Chriſt* himſelf.

It is a problematical Opinion, Whether the honor we give to the Pictures of Saints be a Religious honor? The Angelical Doctor holds the negative, and will have a Religious honor due to none but God; not to the Saints themſelves,

selves, much less to their Pictures.

It is also a disputable Question, which is debated among Catholique Authors, of the Quality of this Honor. *Vasquez* produces Three Opinions current in the Schools; The First is, That though Pictures are honour'd in respect of the Prototype, yet there is a particular honor allotted them, abstracted from the former, as they are ornaments of the Church, and that this honor is of an inferior quality, which is also extended to the Vessels and other Utensils of the Church.

3 p. *disp.* 108.

The second is, That Images may be honour'd in two Respects, in themselves (according to the former explication) and by accident; and when they are honor'd by accident, jointly with the thing represented, they require the same worship as the Prototype.

The

The third and most received Opinion among Divines is, That the picture abstracted from the Prototype, is not capable of any honor at all, but that whosoever honours a Picture must do it with reference to the thing represented. He refutes the secondary honor mentiond in the first and second Opinion, and proves strongly, that we ought only to honor the Prototype in the Picture, and by it; particularly alledging the Council of *Trent*, *That we ought to reverence Pictures, not believing any Divinity or particular vertue in them, but that by the Pictures which we kiss, and before which we kneel, we adore* Jesus Christ, *and venerate the Saints represented.* By these words the Council constitutes Pictures no otherwaies the object of our kneeling and kissing, but as they lead us to the things represented, to which we ought to direct our thoughts

really and cordially. For this Second Proof he demonstrates very apparently, that no inanimated and unreasonable thing is in it self, or can be capable of honor, reverence, or worship: But the Picture of it self is no other; Therefore, &c. since it is not capable of such an excellency to which a man may rationally submit, for the act of submission can only in reason be directed to an object which we conceive our Superior, or endowed with some more excellency: no man submitting to a lower than himself, much less to an irrational or inanimated creature: And whosoever should yield a submission upon this score of servitude, should prevaricate from reason, and commit a kinde of Superstition and Idolatry, in acknowledging a Superiority where it is not due.

All the worship proceeding from an interiour affection, is ever directed to the Prototype adored, if God

God; honoured, if Saints or Persons constituted in authority. The act of worship comprehends two things, the exteriour sign Kneeling, and the interiour Affection directed to him that is endowed with eminency, and from thence claims a Superiority, which can only belong to the Prototype, and not at all to the Picture, which is capable of no excellency superiour to us: the Intention of exhibiting this mark of submission is directed wholly to the thing represented. But this outward mark or sign of kneeling, &c. is performed to the Image; and by reason that kneeling or kissing is part of the worship, it is commonly called (saith *Vasques*) an honor or worship of that which we touch corporally or to which this sign is made. This kissing being applyed to the the Picture, the Picture indeed is honour'd, but only so as that the honor may pass to the Prototype.

On the contrary, the Picture is neither prayed to, nor praised, no not so much as by accident. The same Author teaches, that what is said of Images ought also to be understood of the honor given to the name of *Jesus*, to the Books of the Gospel, to the holy Cross, to the Reliques of the Saints, and to the Sacred Vessels.

This Doctrine thus clearly explicated, is so easie and convincing, even by the Light of Reason, that men must renounce their nature if they refuse to submit and pay this honor due to Pictures. *Daille* both in his *Apology* and in his *Treatise of Pictures* is most Catholique in this Subject, and gives more to Images than *Vasques*, being both a Jesuit and a Spaniard; for *Daillé* avows both this later honor and the secondary, which *Vasques* refuses. Let us hear *Daillé* speak for himself in his *Apology*

ch. 10. pag. 65.

logy. The Adoration of the Ark (citeing the *Psalm* 98. 5. *Adore his footstool, prostrate your selves before his footsteps*) *is a species of honor less then* Latria, *which is due to God alone*: And in his *Treatise of Images* he expresses himself more distinctly thus, *We finde that some in St.* Austins *time did paint both our Lord and the Apostles upon the walls of their houses, which some Protestants omit not to do at this day: And some Protestants make no difficulty to receive Pictures into their Churches.* pag. 311.

And concerning Veneration; *A converted* Jew (according to the Relation of Pope *Gregory*) *had seased by force the Synagogue of his Nation, and therein placed a Crucifix, and the Picture of the B. Virgin* Mary; *but* Gregory *restor'd the Synagogue to the Jews, taking away with much reverence the Pictures, as moveables* lib. 7. *Ep.* 5.

of the Church. And farther, If St. Gregory should have said in expreſs terms, That we ought to uſe Veneration towards Images, it would be ſtill conſiderable, What ſort of worſhip he meant? Whether a Religious worſhip, as they pretend at Rome, (This is demonſtrated falſe). or of an inferior degree of Honor, which is due only to the Inſtruments of Religion, (and this is as much as we require,) and to the perſons and Utenſils of the Church, as Prieſts, Chalices, the Holy Books, which every one calls to mind. Behold Baille a perfect Catholique in this point, and yet a Proteſtant goes farther, and makes no ſcruple to call it a Religious Worſhip, which is given to Pictures, and ſo indeed holds more in that point than he is obliged, to be a Catholique.

Of

CHAP. XI.

Of SATISFACTION.

I Am much taken with *Vasques* expression in his *Treatise of Penance*, That *God to remit us the pain due for sin demands of us not a satispassion, but a satisfaction* (a very usefull Distinction). Note that this is understood by way of Merit; and therefore it has not its effect but only in the just man. We are not delivered from the pain by *satispassion*, but by *satisfaction*, and that in the nature of Merit towards God. From hence we conclude, That the just make satisfaction to God, not only by their penal works, but also by those of any other vertue, and that every meritorious work is also satisfactory. His Reason is this, That

Quest. 94. Art. 2.

That if in the works of Merit we acknowledg a condignity of Eternal Life, and of an Encreaſe of Sanctity, why not alſo of the Remiſſion of Temporal pain? this being ordained to obtain the other. And a little after, *Satisfaction is performed by way of Merit, and this only requires a good work worthy of ſuch praiſe or recompence; but he that works well is not only worthy of Eternal Life, but merits alſo to be delivered from all impediment of attaining it:* Hitherto *Vaſques.*

We have heretofore gain'd a Subſcription from our Adverſaries in the point of *Merit*; and therefore (the Queſtion being rightly ſtated) we require the ſame in matter of Satisfaction; for, How can they rationally deny that good works ſhould take away the temporal puniſhment due to ſin, ſince formerly they granted that Eternal Life was merited and obtained by

Good

Good Works? But ſince their diſlike grows from a miſunderſtanding of theſe our Satisfactions, I intend to ſpeak more diſtinctly of them, and to handle them particularly in this place, before I fall upon *Purgatory*, and *Indulgences*, by reaſon of the natural connexion of theſe Queſtions the one with the other. *If any one holds* (ſayes the Council of *Trent*) *that we do not ſatisfie God, through the merits of Chriſt for our ſinnes, in what concerns the temporal pain due unto them, by ſuch puniſhments as he ſends us, or are enjoyned by the Prieſts; no nor by thoſe which we voluntarily perform of our ſelves, as by Faſting, Prayer, Almes, and other works of piety, Anathema.* And again, [*can.* 14.] *If any one ſay, that the Satisfactions* (*which Penitents redeemed by Chriſt, perform for their ſinnes*) *do obſcure the benefit of Chriſts death, Anathema* Sess. 14. can. 13.

nathema. These are Articles of Faith.

Let us now separate the Doctrines of the Schools, and all Problematical Questions, as formerly we did in the point of *Merit*. It is not of Faith, that our *Satisfactions* are of condignity, or of congruity; or of congruity by Justice, or by rigor of Justice, or by mercy: but it is of Faith, *That through the merits of Christ we satisfie for such pains, and that by* Jesus Christ *we satisfie for our sinnes by the help of his Satisfactions, which merits of* Christ *proceed meerly from his mercy towards us*. This is evident in that the Council propoſeth nothing to be held of *condignity, Justice*, &c. And that our *Satisfactions* for the temporal pains are by way of merit, as I alledged formerly out of *Vasques*.

The Council, ſpeaking of our *Satisfactions*, mentions no more than what concerns the temporal pains. It doth not therefore teach, that we can

can satisfie God for the guilt of sin, neither venial nor mortal, nor any thing at all concerning the Eternal pains. *Satisfaction for the guilt is by some so call'd* (Tayes Vasques 3 P. *disp.* 2. *Chap.* 1, 2.) *because by it, it seems, enough is done on the part of the sinner to blot out the guilt which he had contracted, and the guilt being once blotted out, all the ground of offence is taken away: But the most approved Opinion among Divines, is, That no man, though furnisht with the assistance of the grace of God, can either by Contrition or any other good works perfectly and truly satisfie for sin.* And again, *Chap.* 6. *The name of Satisfaction for mortal sin is so ungrateful to some of our Divines, that they will not condescend, that any satisfaction can be made for the guilt of sin, though assisted by the Grace and favor of God, but only for temporal punishment after the guilt*

of

of sin, and Eternal Pains are remitted gratis: *For, if we could satisfie in any way for mortal sin, our Justification would not be* Gratis, *but in some manner relying upon works, which would absolutely destroy the nature of Grace. And since* Christ *hath fully and perfectly satisfy'd for our sinnes, it follows, that our* Satisfaction *would be superfluous.*

Vasques goes yet farther, and showes it is the Opinion of *Scotus* and other Divines, *That the just man cannot perfectly satisfie for his Venial sin*; and proves it thus: *We beg this every day in the Lords Prayer, That God would forgive us our venial, and quotidian debts, and the blotting out of venial sin is call'd by us* remission, *signifying the grace and favour of him that remits without paiment.*

As for Satisfaction of the temporal pain due to sin, which yet remains to be explicated; The Council

Council of *Trent* (*can.* 13, 14.) will not at all allow our works satisfactory, but only by *Jesus Christ*, and his Merits; and that we satisfie in *Christ*, doing fruits worthy of Repentance, which receive a force from him, are offer'd to his Father by him, and by his means are accepted of his Farher. According to which, as our actions of Faith, Hope, Alms, Penance, and the Sacraments of Baptism, Eucharist, *&c.* as also the Sacrifice of the Mass, are not to us at all propitiatory, but by application of that Propitiation performed by *Jesus Christ* upon the Cross.

Alphonsus de Castro, in his Book of Penance (being willing to answer that vulgar Objection of our Separatists; That Christ having satisfied for us, as well for the guilt of sin, as the Punishment both eternal and temporal, It is a wrong done *Quest.* 94. *dub.* 1.

to

to his Merit, and to his Satisfaction, if we think it needfull to satisfie by our works; as esteeming his Death and Merit insufficient) replies, *That the passion of* Christ hath so *satisfied for our sinnes, that God will not be satisfied by it alone, in case it be not by us particularly applyed, which is done by the Sacraments, and by our good works; and yet withall he hath appointed, that the passion and merit of* Christ *being as it were linked to our good works, our Satisfaction may be accepted through his grace and favour.* Ledesmus seems inclinable to the same manner of speaking: *The* Lutherans (saith he) *who seem so much to relie upon the Passion of Christ, doubt not also to believe that Faith is necessary for those that are of age of discretion, and Baptism for little children. Therefore they are not wholly and effectually relieved by the Merits of Christ, for they seek Faith as we do good works;*

works; and as by Faith alone according to their DICTAMEN, *Christs passion is applyed to them, so by Faith and Good Works we aim at the same End.*

In the like manner both *Ledesmus* and *Durandus*, by the Relation of *Vasques*, agree in saying, *That only by the bounty and meer goodness of God, in accepting our satisfaction, a man may satisfie by way of condignity for the temporal pains due to sin.* And *Joannes Medina* holds, That our Satisfaction cannot be condign for the temporal pain, if pain of Purgatory be of a different nature from the pains of this Life, and proves it thus; *He that payes a Debt in a different and lower nature then what is due, needs the mercy of his Creditor for the accepting his payment. And so in our case* (saies he) *the mercy of God is necessary for the accepting of our Satisfaction.*

Let

1. 2 *disp.* 214. chap. 1, 2.

Let us adde towards rendring our Catholick Doctrine easie, as well in the point of *Merit*, as *Satisfaction*, the Opinion of some Catholique Divines cited by *Vasques*; The first is, That the works of Just men, considered as they proceed from the help of the Grace of God, and admitting also the sanctity of the party, have no condignity or force of Merit, as to Eternal Life; But that the Merit and dignity wholly proceeds from the Providence and Covenant of God. To this Opinion adhere *Scotus*, *Gregorius*, *Gabriel*, *Ocam*, *and Alphonsus de Castro*, &c. and it is proved out of the Council of *Trent*, (*Sess.* 14. cap. 8, 9.) That our works of themselves bear no proportion with that great reward of Eternal Life, if God did not of his mercy both promise and accept them. From this Doctrine some of them

them seem to conclude, That every good Work, done by man remaining in a pure naturallity, without the help of Grace would be meritorious of Eternal Life, by the very acceptance of God; For, if God would bestow Eternal Beatitude upon man for such a work, that work would he made worthy of Eternal Life by the very acceptance or Promise of God. And on the contrary, the Promise of God, set aside the work, is of no validity at all. Some other Authors would also deduce from this Principle, that the works of man wrought by necessity may be accepted of God, as rewardable with Eternal Life, and by that means made meritorious.

As for *Satisfaction*, *Vasques* (having cited the words of the Council of *Trent*) infers, That the Council determines, that all the dignity of our Satisfaction proceeds from our works being offered by *Christ*, and

and through him accepted by his Father; as if the Council should say, our Works are not satisfactory, if they were not offer'd by *Christ*, and accepted by the Father. And the same Reason seems to be of force in what concerns our Good Works, that they may be deem'd meritorious: For, if our Works were satisfactory in themselves, without acceptation, the Council would not say, It is a great Argument of the Divine Love, that the Punishments inflicted by God, are to him satisfactory.

The second Opinion is of some pious Divines, who teach that the Works of the just (as they are Works of the just, and perform'd by the help of Grace) have some little dignity in them of Eternal Life, but a far greater in that they rely upon the goodness and Merits of *Christ*, and are in some manner his proper Merits; and that the

reason

reason of Merit in the works of the Just is deduced clearly from this, that the Action of the just is not wholly his own action, but the action of Christ; for Christ, as head having an influence upon the members, worketh and meriteth in that manner that every just man may say with St. *Paul*, *Gal.* 2. 20. *I live, no more I, but Christ lives in me.* I fast, no more I, but Christ fasts in me, I merit, no more I, but Christ merits in me. According to this sense we say usually, that our good works, as they are water'd with the blood of Christ, and offer'd up with his Merits, become worthy of so large recompense; For, who can oblige God, either to promise Life Everlasting to our works; or that he should accept them for satisfaction of the punishment due to our sinnes, without which they are neither meritorious nor Satisfactory.

The same *Vasques* produces other

other Divines that teach, the Merits of Christ are imputed to us upon several respects; not only, that, in consideration of them the assistance of Grace may be given us to perform Good Works, by which we may merit everlasting beatitude; but also there is added another Imputation of the same Merits of *Christ*, and a special favor from God to those same good works already performed by the help of his Grace, that they may be rendred meritorious. And they say, that our works already acted in the state of Justice, and by the help of Grace, are not in themselves, and in their own circumstances of condignity to so great a reward, as is that of everlasting joy; and consequently they affirm, This particular Imputation and Communication of the Merits of *Christ* is done to the end God by his favour may render our works worthy of this great reward, and

his

his acceptance may give them a just condignity.

Moreover God, who freely may deny our Works the reward of eternal Life, hath freely promised it: And all that God has granted for our Salvation, he has granted in consideration of the Merits of *Christ*, being induc'd by those merits to give us freely that which he might in rigor have deny'd. We must now (saies *Vasques*) apply the same Discourse of the Imputation of the Merits of *Christ* for satisfaction of temporal Punishment, that our works, performed in grace, may become meritorious: and also remember what I hinted in the beginning of this Chapter, That our *Satisfactions* are not Satispassions, but Satisfactions by way of Merit, though in truth they have more force to pay the debt of Punishment, than our Merits have to obtain Everlasting Beatitude.

CHAP. XII.

Of SATISFACTIONS and MERITS for another man.

I Have ſaid ſomething on this Subject before, intending to enlarge my ſelf in this Chapter. All acknowledg (ſales *Vaſques*) that no Juſt man can merit for another neither Grace nor Juſtification, nor the leaſt degree or help towards it, but only for himſelf; According to which, neither the B. Virgin, nor the Apoſtles have merited the leaſt help of Grace for others; and therefore no Juſt man can perfectly ſatisfie for another, nor any one under the notion of a creature: For this reaſon it was neceſſary, That a perfect Satisfaction ſhould be made for our ſinnes, and

3 p. *Tom.* 1. *d.* ſp. 4. c. 5.

and that *Christ* should become man, who alone was capable to satisfie for the sinnes of man: The Merit of Grace or Glory is in it self so personal, that no man can bestow his Merit upon another, to the end it may avail for the gaining of Glory, or become the price of that great reward; but it must be His proper and personal work, for by it alone man is made worthy of Everlasting Life. Thus you see, no creature, not the *B. Virgin* her self, can either merit the Remission of our sinnes, or Glory, or Grace. This Prerogative is proper to *Jesus Christ*, exclusively of all creatures: Our Separatists do not question us upon this point, but only whether Satisfaction may be made for the temporal pain due to another mans sin, the guilt being taken away. For their better satisfaction, and to facilitate their Return to the Church in this point, I say,

It

It is not an Article of Faith, That a man, though just, can satisfie for the pain due to the sin of another man already forgiven. I shew it by our *Rule of Faith*, for the Council of *Trent* does not at all propose unto us, that we can satisfie for another, or for the temporal Punishment due to another mans sin.

Suares, treating this Subject, produces several Opinions, The First, of some Modern Divines, that no Faithfull man can satisfie for another either living or dead, or pay the Punishment due to another mans sin, but only implore of God a Remission *Gratis* of pain for sinnes committed, or the Grace to do works worthy of Penance: The ground of this Opinion is, because the Debt of Punishment is a personal Debt; since man by reason of his sin is in himself worthy of Punishment, not in another,

another, and therefore he contracts a Debt which muſt be paid, either by the Action or Paſſion of the the Debter himſelf, and not of another. The enſuing Diſcourſe of *Suares* upon this Subject is very uſefull.

The Fundamental Reaſon of this ought to be derived from the Divine Inſtitution, in what regards Rewards or Puniſhments. A man can determine nothing in reſpect of the nature of the thing it ſelf, but in relation to the ſoveraign will of the Legiſlator, who might have preſcribed only *Purgatory* for the Puniſhment of ſin remitted, and then it had been impoſſible to make any ſatisfaction at all in this life: he might alſo have extended this disjunctive ſo far, that man ſhould either ſuffer ſuch a pain in Purgatory, or ſatisfie in this life, either by himſelf or his friends, and then (in what concerns the Divine Law)

it had been ſufficiently ſatisfied by this means. This Doctrine explicates very plainly, as well the point of *Satisfaction*, as that of *Merits*: and *Vaſques* affirms, that the Satisfaction of one for another relates to the conſent of God, accepting a Satisfaction whereby to take away the Debt as well of Guilt as of Puniſhmenr. But *Suarez* adds thus in the place alledged, we have no Teſtimony from the *Scripture*, or from *Tradition*, by which we are ſufficiently convinced, that there is any ſuch Divine Inſtitution, but rather what is formerly ſaid, may be expounded in rigor of Satisfaction by way of Impetration.

Suarez (in the laſt place cited) adds that among thoſe who teach, We may ſatisfie for another: The Firſt Opinion is, That this Satisfaction depends upon the free acceptance of God, and that it is not infallible, though it be offer'd by a juſt

Juſt man, and for a Juſt man; ſo ſay *Medina* and *Cordúba*; and their ground is, becauſe the Judg is never obliged to accept the Satisfaction due from a Criminal by another hand, though it were perhaps equal, but uſually to puniſh the Delinquent himſelf, it being neither derived from Scripture, nor Tradition, that there is any ſuch known Law or Promiſe, that God will accept ſatisfaction from any other hand, becauſe it is generally eſteem'd that it properly belongs to *Jeſus Chriſt*, as well to merit as to ſatisfie condignly for others. And a little after he delivers his own Opinion thus: *We have no certain Revelation of this Promiſe or Divine Covenant, nor yet convincing or very preſſing Reaſons derived from revealed Principles; Notwithſtanding it is not unlikely to be true, and it is more credible than otherwiſe, that God hath favourably*

eſtabliſht this Law, to the end we may ſatisfie for our ſelves and friends.

The ſame Author [*Sect. 6.*] ſpeaking of *Satisfactions* offer'd to God for the dead, ſhowes (according to the Opinion of approved Divines) *That Satisfaction for the ſouls in Purgatory is only of Mercy*, which is held by *Cajetan*, *Canus*, *Soto*, &c. The proper and only Reaſon is, becauſe there is no Promiſe or Divine Covenant that God accepts our Satisfactions for the dead, of which this is a pregnant ſign, That the Church and the Saints implore God, that he will vouchſafe to accept the Suffrages for the deceaſed: It is therefore an evident Argument, that it is a work of mercy, not of juſtice, and we may alſo gather it from thence, that the ſoules in Purgatory are out of all Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, and only liable to the Judgment and will of God;

God: Since then it is not certain that there is any such Covenant in behalf of the Living, it is very unlikely there should be any for the Dead; it being no wayes apparent by any sufficient Testimony or Reason. And hence it is we say usually, that the Souls in Purgatory receive help by way of Suffrage, from our Satisfactions, and the Indulgences of the Church; by which is sufficiently excluded the conceit of any infallible application by the way of Justice. And then he delivers his own Opinion thus. *If it be infallible, it must needs follow from some Law or Divine Promise, for Infallibility can proceed from no other ground.*

What I have said of *Satisfaction* for another, ought to be understood of *Merit* for another, to wit, That it is no Article of Faith, that we can merit for another, not only by *Condignity* (which all Doctors reject)

but even by *Congruity*. I prove it thus, This very terme *Merit by Congruity* is not found in the Council, much leſs, *Merit by congruity for another man*, therefore not of Faith. Beſides, we do not finde in Scripture any mention of a Divine Promiſe or Inſtitution, that one Juſt man may merit for another; and yet, all depends upon this Promiſe, as well in regard of *Merit* as *Satisfaction*; and *Satisfaction* is (as I ſaid before) by way of *Merit*, but ſince it is not of Faith, that we can ſatisfie for another, it is no wonder at all that we cannot *merit* for another, both being by way of Impetration and Prayer, which have no Infallible Effect for want of a Promiſe, by which God is ſolely obliged.

Concerning

CHAP. XIII.

Concerning the TREASURE of SATISFACTION from the Merits of Saints.

IT is not an Article of Faith, That there is any such Treasure in the Church, nor deduced by consequence (as I shall show hereafter) that *Indulgences* are granted upon that score. I prove it by our *General Rule of Faith*; for, neither the Council of *Trent* [*Sess.* 25.] which is of *Indulgences*, nor any other General Council propoſeth any such Doctrine: 'Tis true, some such thing is mentioned in the *Extravagant Unigenitus of* Clement *the* 6th, and it is only contained in the *Diſpoſitive*. The Pope produces nothing there

de Pœnitentia & Remiſſione.

but his own Opinion, writes only to a particular man, and propoſeth nothing to the whole Church, neither is the Definition of a Pope ſufficient to ſettle an Article of Faith. Look back upon our *General Rule of Faith*, and withall conſider my former Argument, That one juſt man cannot ſatisfie for the ſinnes of another, either living or dead; and this pretended Treaſure will ſoon vaniſh away.

Suarez upon this Subject, affirms, That beſides *Mayron*, *Durandus* has abſolutely deny'd this Treaſure of the Church compoſed of the Merits and Satisfactions of the Saints, and produceth Two Reaſons; The Firſt is, the ſame of *Mayron*, to wit, that the Merits of Saints are condignly recompenſed in their own perſons: The Second, That the Saints have no Superfluous Merit; for all avail's, or is efficacious in way of reward, and nothing remains

remains to be put to this Treasure. And a little lower he sayes, some hold, That all works, as they relate to Satisfaction, are so individually his that acts, or suffers, that none but *Jesus Christ* can bestow them upon another, or pay anothers debt. According to which Doctrine we may affirm confidently, That the Treasure of the Church is not compos'd of the Merits of Saints; and that nothing of that is applyed by way of Indulgence, for the Payment of Temporal Punishments.

It is true, *Suares* seems to approve, as a common Opinion of Divines, That there is a Treasure of Merits and Satisfactions dispenc'd by the Church, which he endeavours to prove; but withall, in the name of those that deny this Treasure, he has these words, *I advertise you, that they deny not but that the works of the Just remain in some manner*

in the Treasure of the Church, as to procure for us by Intercession, and merit, by way of Congruity, several Benefits. I believe our Separatists themselves will easily admit a Treasure upon this score, presupposing (what I formerly noted) that many grave Divines will not give way to this word *Merit of Congruity*, nor *Satisfaction of Congruity* for ourselves, much less for others.

In fine, this Treasure (according to the Divines alledged by *Suares*, treating of the Merits and Satisfaction of Saints) will amount to no more, than that the good Life, and good Works of the Saints have a prevalent vertue and force for the obtaining of many benefits, and that the Divine Goodness affords several Favors and Graces to the Living, upon that consideration. And farther I presume, our Separatists will not deny this Doctrine, nor the communication of this Treasure,

Treasure, so often and so clearly set down in the Scripture; God said to *Jacob*, Gen. 26. 24. *I will bless thee for Abrahams sake my servant.* Psal. 37. 35. *For the love of David thy servant avert not thy face from thy Anointed*: meaning *Solomon. Do not reject the Prayers which the King offers for his people in general*, according to the Gloss of *Geneva. I will defend this City for Davids sake my servant.* They seem also to admit the Intercession of the Saints in heaven; and to acknowledge, that God bestowes many favors for their sake, which is in effect to admit this Treasure in our sence. And why are we not then agreed in this Point?

Of

CHAP. XIV.

Of PURGATORY.

OUr Profeſſion of Faith hath theſe Words; I HOLD CONSTANTLY THAT THERE IS A PURGATORY. Theſe are extracted out of the Council of *Trent* [*Seſs.* 25.] This is an undoubted Article of Faith being decreed by the Council. But on the contrary it is no Article of Faith, That there is a Fire in Purgatory. *Bellarmin* [*lib.* 2. *cap.* 11.] upon this Subject delivers, as a currant Opinion among Divines, That there is a true and proper Fire in *Purgatory* of the ſame ſpecies with our Elementary fire: which Opinion is not of Faith, becauſe never defin'd by the Church; nay the Greeks proteſted againſt it in the Council;

Council of *Florence*, and that Council in the laſt Seſſion defin'd *Purgatory*, without mentioning the Fire; and yet I hold it a very probable Opinion. By this you ſee (according to *Bellarmine*) that it is no Article of Faith, no more than where the place of Purgatory is, in which the Church alſo hath defin'd nothing.

Moreover, 'Tis not defin'd what the Pains of Purgatory are, nor how griev us, though (according to *Bellarmin*) all admit them greater than the Puniſhments of this life, which is alſo variouſly underſtood: St. *Thomas* holds, That the greateſt Pain in the world is leſs than the leaſt of Purgatory: But St. *Bonaventure* teacheth, That the Pain of loſs or privation in *Purgatory* is not greater than the Puniſhment of *Purgatory*, nor the Puniſhment of this life. That the Pains of *Purgatory* are greater than thoſe of this life

life in this ſence, that the greateſt in *Purgatory* are more grievous than the greateſt in this life, though there may be found in *Purgatory* leſs Puniſhment than the Pains in this life: And this Opinion I rather aſſent unto: Hitherto *Bellarmin.*

It is not alſo of Faith, How long the Pains of Purgatory laſt. *Soto* (by Relation of *Bellarmin*) is of Opinion, That no man ſtaies longer in *Purgatory* than Ten years, which he rejects in theſe words; *To determine a thing ſo uncertain cannot be done without Temerity.*

The way to an Agreement in this Point is both eaſie and plain, by ſeparating ſuch Opinions as are not of Faith, and propounding only what the Church obliges us to accept, compar'd with what the Separatiſts themſelves maintain. *Calvin* in his *Inſtitutions*, lib. 3. c. 25. *Sect.* 6. placeth the ſouls of the Faithfull after death, even to the day

day of Judgment, in a place out of heaven, where they expect (saith he) the fruition of the glory promised, and all things remain in suspence untill our Saviour appear as our Redeemer. This suspension or expectation must needs be grievous in regard the Object expected is so vehemently desired. Here is undoubtedly a third place, besides Heaven and Hell, where pain is suffer'd by the Faithfull deceased, even to the day of Judgment. This *Purgatory* of *Calvin* is more lasting, more general, and consequently, more troublesome in the Circumstances, than what the Church proposeth by the Council of *Trent*.

But, Suppose a Faithful person dye surpris'd by an Apoplexy with some little disorder of sin, for which he is not in the state of damnation, this soul must of necessity be purged, before she can be admitted into Heaven, *wherein nothing that is*

foul

fowl can enter. This Soul therefore muſt be for ſome time in Purgatory, or at leaſt in a third place. But ſince (according to our Separatiſts in their Confeſſion of Faith) their ſinnes are not imputed to them in this life, but the fault or guilt remains ſtill; it is neceſſary for the attaining of heaven, where nothing can enter that is foul; and though the filth be not in this world imputed, yet after this life all filth and faults muſt be waſh'd away, and purged: where? not in heaven, for there nothing foul can be admitted; not in earth, for, according to them, the guilt of ſin is not remitted there: It muſt be then out of the world, and out of heaven, in a third place where they are really purged both from guilt and ſin; and that being the common place for the Faithfull, they muſt go all into *Purgatory*. Finally, If the Doctrine, that the body of *Jeſus Chriſt* is contain'd under

under the ſymbols of the Euchariſt, hath no venome in it, nor prejudice to piety, why ſhould there be any in this of *Purgatory*, as it is deliver'd in the ſence of the Church. They ought therefore to believe it, according to *Daillé*, under pain of being eſteem'd neither good Chriſtians, tolerable Citizens, or men of common ſence.

CHAP. XV.

Of SUFFRAGES for the DEAD.

OUr *Profeſſion of Faith*, taken out of the Council of *Trent*, ſaies thus; I FIRMLY HOLD, THAT THE SOULS IN PURGATORY ARE RELIEVED BY THE SUFFRAGES OF THE FAITHFULL: But theſe enſuing Opinions

nions are not of Faith, in which the Council is altogether silent. *Cajetan* teacheth, (as *Bellarmin* relates) that all soules are assisted by the common Suffrages of the living, but those for whom particular Suffrages are offer'd, are not relievd, unless, whilest they were here on earth, they had a special care and Devotion for the Keys of the Church, and for the souls departed. Others say, the Suffrages offer'd for a particular man are not only available to him, but to all the souls in general, and no less to them than to him. But the common Opinion seems to hold a middle way, That Suffrages offer'd for a particular man are only to him beneficial by way of *Satisfaction* for whom they are offer'd, and this Doctrine *Bellarmin* labours to prove.

It is not also of Faith, whether *Suffrages* are beneficial by way of Satisfaction or Intercession? *Suarez* in

in his Treatiſe of *Suffrages*, moving this difficulty, demands, whether temporal Pains are not ſometimes remitted *Gratis*, by the Merits and Prayers of Juſt men, who beg it of God by their Prayers, without tendering or performing any thing by way of Satisfactions. The Firſt Opinion anſwers this Queſtion, and affirms generally, that this way of imploring by way of *Suffrage*, is not only poſſible, but that we can give no other aſſiſtance certain and effective but this. This is conſtantly held by moſt, and chiefly by thoſe Divines who reject Satisfaction one for another; it being an undoubted Principle, that our *Suffrages* cannot be more efficacious for the dead, than for the living.

The ſecond Opinion affirms, that this means of remitting, *Gratis*, by way of Interceſſion, is ſometimes obtained, though the other alſo is more practicable by paying an equal

equal price. The former is grounded upon this reason, That the Church doth often pray to God for the delivery of souls out of *Purgatory* by his bountifull and pious mercy; therefore she pretends to obtain Remission *gratis*, and moreover, that Prayer hath such vertue in it self, as to obtain its end without an equal price: And *Suares* further adds; This opinion is pious and probable; yet I say, two things; the First, That this way of Remitting is uncertain, and not thoroughly grounded: Secondly, That it seems very probable to many, that God never remits Pain due for sin, if they do not offer or apply a condign Satisfaction, and that he never doth it altogether *gratis*, without observing the rule of vindicative Justice. I am fully perswaded, no man can obtain for himself *Gratis* a remission of Pain due for sin; therefore none can obtain it for another man living

living, much leſs for the deceaſed in Purgatory. The ſame Author adds, That of thoſe who admit ſuffrages by application of our Satisfactions for the dead, their Opinion is, That Satisfaction for the ſouls in Purgatory is only of mercy. The reaſon is, becauſe there is nothing of Premiſe or Covenant from God in this caſe, which is an evident ſign, that the Church implor's God to accept theſe Suffrages for the dead.

Hence I infer, That neither the one nor the other way of Suffrage is of Faith: to wit, neither by Interceſſion *gratis*, or tender of Satisfaction, but only in general, according to the Profeſſion of Faith, that the Souls are relieved by the Suffrages of the Faithfull: The reſt belongs to the Schools, and not to the certainty of Faith. The ſame *Suares* *Diſp.* 53. *Sec.* 3. produceth alſo ſome Authors, ſaying, Private Suffrages offer'd for the dead have no ſuch vertue

vertue as to be infallibly accepted, And ſome others conceive, the Sacrifice of the Maſs is not of that certainty, or any other work whatſoever, as infallibly to free a ſoul in Purgatory, *ex opere operato.*

3 p. *diſp.* 228. chap. 4.

Vaſques goes on thus. Let us ſee whether the Remiſſion of Pain be ſo certainly attain'd by vetrue of this Sacrifice, that it alwayes hath effect by a certain Law or Promiſe; *Sotus*, *Canus*, *Corduba* are of Opinion, that this Sacrifice works conſtantly the Remiſſion of Puniſhment by a certain Law, in what relates to the living, though not to the dead, but that it is beneficial to them by way of ſuffrage. This way of Suffrage (according as they underſtand it) is, that the prayers of the living avail the deceaſed, as God is pleaſed to accept them, and that there is no certain Law eſtabliſht for the Remiſſion

Remiſſion of temporal Puniſhment due to ſin: And moreover that the Sacrifice of the *Maſs* is available this way, and the like of Indulgences granted for the dead; and as they eſteem the effect of Indulgences leſs certain in regard of the dead than the living, ſo they judg of the Sacrifice of the *Maſs*, yet the common and moſt approved Opinion is, that this effect of remitting pain, as well to the dead as the living is alwayes given, and that it is ſo ordain'd by God by a certain Law. And to this Opinion adhere ſuch as teach, That the Suffrages which by the Faithfull are offer'd for the dead are certainly available: This is abundantly ſufficient to ſhew what is of *Faith* in this Subject, and what of *Opinion*.

Diſp. 229. *chap.* 1.

From theſe Premiſes, and from what is added by *Vaſquez*, it is clear, that

that neither the Sacrifice of the *Mass*, nor any other Suffrage work's a Remission of Pain, *ex opere operato*, which is the term of the Schools, though variously expounded by our own Doctors.

We are then agreed, (presupposing *Purgatory*, to which I open'd a way in my last Chapter,) And now (laying aside all misunderstandings, and the Problematical Questions of the Schools) I shall insist upon the same methode I made choice of in the Question of *Satisfaction* or *Merit for another*. For, who can deny, That God hath granted many favors at the Prayers, and in consideration of the Sanctity of his most Faithfull Servants, and particularly, for their sakes, abated the Punishment of such Demerits as deserved a severe chastisement: And why may we not then expect the same mercy in *Purgatory*? Let us then conclude with bare-

asserting

asserting our Profession of Faith, without any mixture of Opinions: THAT THE SOULES DETAIN'D IN PURGATORY ARE RELIEV'D BY THE SUFFRAGES OE THE FAITHFULL.

CHAP. XVI.

Of INDULGENCES.

IN our Profession of Faith we say; I BELIEVE, THAT THE POWER OF INDULGENCES HATH BEEN GIVEN, AND LEFT IN THE CHURCH, BY *JESUS CHRIST*; AND THAT THE USE OF THEM IS VERY BENEFICIAL TO ALL CHRISTIAN PEOPLE.

The Council of *Trent* ſpeaks the ſame in theſe words: *Since the power of giving Indulgences hath been beſtowed upon the Church by* Jeſus Chriſt, *and that ſhe hath made uſe of this power, which hath been divinely left her even from ancient times. The holy Synod teaches and commends the uſe of Indulgences as very beneficial to all Chriſtian people, and approved by the authority of other holy Synods; and that they ought to be retained in the Church, and denounceth* Anathema *to thoſe who aſſert, they are unprofitable, or deny there is a power in the Church of giving them. Notwithſtanding ſhe admoniſheth, that the granting them be done with great moderation according to the ancient and approved cuſtome of the Church; for fear that by too great a remiſneſs, Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline be weakned.*

The

This undoubtedly belongs to Faith, since it is propos'd by a General Council. On the contrary, Other Doctrines concerning *Indulgences*, not propos'd by the Church, are not of Faith; for since the Fathers of the Church (where there was a considerable number of Eminent Divines, vers'd in all sorts of Learning, and who particularly sifted this Subject) did adventure to propose no more; it is a demonstrative Argument to me, that we ought to own no more, as belonging to Faith; and hardly for a well-grounded Doctrine.

Hence I conclude, it is not an Article of Faith, That the Church has power to grant *Indulgences*, whereby the Punishment due (in the Court of God) to sin remitted may be taken away, or the pains in Purgatory: much less is it an Article of Faith, That the Church, in the grant of these, hath any Inten-

tion to remit these Pains, but rather, that both the Power and the Intention go no farther, than to grant a Remission of Cannonical Penances heretofore very severely imposed. This appears first by our foresaid *Rule of Faith*; For the Council neither mentions the one nor the other of these Pains due to sin, and consequently, they are not within the verge of Faith, belonging to Indulgences: Secondly, it is notorious, That the Council does not oblige us to acknowledg any other power of Indulgences in the Church than the undoubted use of them by Authority of Holy Synods, and according to the Ancient approved Customes of the Church.

Tom. 1. *of Ind.* Disp. 49. Sect. 2. *Suares*, treating this Subject, saies thus, The Council of *Trent*, mentioning the use of Indulgences approved by General Synods, intends those that are usually cited to that purpose, as that

that of *Nice*, [can. 11.] the Fourth of *Carthage*, chap. 75. of *Neocesaria*, ch. 3. of *Agdes*, can. 6. of *Laodicea*, can. 1, and 2. But we only read, in these, That it was alwayes lawfull and usual for Bishops to remit their Penitents some part of those publick Cannonical Penances, which were often inflicted for certain heinous Crimes, if the life and laudable conversation of the Penitent did seem to deserve so great a favor. And we do not gather at all from these Synods, that this Remission extended to diminish the obligation of the Punishment due before God; and therefore we cannot draw from thence any solid Argument, but, at most, a conjecture by some probable inducement.

The same Author having cited at large the Testimonies of S. *Cyprian*, *Basil*, *Gregory* of *Nice*, besides several Synods, even to the time of S. *Cyprian*, and from thence, to that of S. *Gregory* the Great, concerning the

remiſſion of Puniſhments, ordained as well by the Diſcipline of the Church for publique ſins, as by the Sacrament of Penance, *in foro exteriore*, conclud's thus: *It is eaſy to evince, by theſe Teſtimonies alledged, That it was an ancient cuſtome in the Primitive Church, to remit ſometimes theſe Penances, either by pardoning them after they were impos'd, or, having abſolved the Penitents* in foro exteriore, *by a mitigation of the Penance enjoyned; But it is ſomewhat difficult to explicate how we may prove by this way of remiſſion, that there was then, as now, (pretended by ſome) the uſe of Indulgences, ſince that Remiſſion preciſly taken, did not blot out the Obligation due to ſin remitted; and the Prelate, receiving the penitent to the peace and unity of the Ch. without any ſuch condition, did not free him from the pain of P. but left it ſo as that it was neceſſary for the ſaid penitent to make a farther Satisfaction, either through the ferv-*

of his Conversion, or by some other means. And after some Discourse upon this Subject he concludes thus; *It doth not seem to me improbable to affirm, that, in the times preceding* Gregory *the Great, by Indulgences were only remitted the Penances impos'd by the Ministers of the Church, and not any pain due in the judgment of God; by reason that what we read of in those dayes doth not sufficiently evince the present use of Indulgences.*

And as for me (saies *Suarez*) *All that I have alledg'd perswades me to this thought; for nothing I meet with fully satisfies me: Only from the ancient practice some conjecture may be drawn:* Thus far *Suarez.*

Wherefore considering the *Major* of the Council, and the *minor* compos'd of these Inferences, I shall persist in my former Conclusion of severing that which is not Faith from what is taught by the

ſaid Council, being farther induced unto it by ſome other Catholique Authors alledged by *Suarez* himſelf.

Some Catholiques ſay, That by *Indulgences* there is not any Remiſſion at all of pain due to ſin, in the judgment of God, but only the Obligation taken away of performing Cannonical Penances impos'd by the Church: And *Cajetan* teaches, That by *Indulgences* are only remitted the Penances impos'd by the Miniſters of the Church; but not at all the Puniſhment due to ſin in the judgment of God; and farther, ſpeaking not of the power, but preſent uſe of Indulgences, goes on thus: *Some have thought, That by Indulgences, which are now actually granted, there is no remiſſion of pain due to ſin, in the judgment of God, but only of the obligation of performing the Sacramental Penances, which opinion I hold,*

Suarez. diſp. 50. Sect. 3.

old, and mentioned both by S. Thomas, *and S.* Bonaventure: *The ground of it is, because often* de jure *Indulgences are said to be granted for Penances enjoined, as is evident in the Chapter,* Cum ex eo. de Pœnitentia, *&c.* From whence we may collect; That the General Form of granting *Indulgences* was of Penances enjoyned, since the Popes themselves grant *Indulgences* for Seven Years, or Forty Dayes, which numbers relate to the Penitential Cannons, charging Penances according to the ancient form of the Church, and the Degrees of sinnes. In fine, This Opinion is confirmed by the Ancient use of Indulgences, first, only for the relaxation of publique Penances, but after extended to Sacramental Penances, and so they continue to this day, and no more is remitted by Indulgences, but the rigor of Penances injoyn'd.

Bellarmin, lib. 1. c. 7. in his Book of *Indulgences*, ſaies thus, *This Propoſition, That by Indulgences men are freed from the Obligation of puniſhment, not only in the face of the Church, but alſo, before God, was anciently denyed by ſome, reported and confuted by ancient Divines, S.* Thomas, *and others: I prove it* (ſaith he) *againſt thoſe Catholicks who are not ſo right in this point.* Hence I conclude it no Article of Faith, That the Church hath a power to remit, by *Indulgences*, the pains due before God, or in Purgatory; much leſs, That the Church, by the Grant of Indulgences, hath any Intention of remitting them, or doth actually remit them. And 'tis ſufficient for a Catholick, to acknowledg the other Power, and the Exerciſe of it: And who can in reaſon reject this power, and the Practice of it? Our Separatiſts themſelves grant Indulgences in the ſame ſence.

Nor

Nor is it an Article of Faith, That the Church hath any power to grant Indulgences for the dead, or that by thoſe Indulgences a Soul may be delivered out of Purgatory: Or that by ſaying Maſs on a Privileg'd Altar, a ſoul may be deliver'd out of Purgatory, I prove this in the ſame manner as before; Firſt becauſe the Council of *Trent* teacheth it not: Secondly, becauſe the ſilence of the Fathers of that Council (who were not Ignorant of theſe Opinions and Practiſes) ſhews poſitively, that they did not own them to be of Faith. Thirdly, I prove it, out of what is affirm'd by *Suarez*, *Diſp.* 94. *ſect.* 1. That *ſome Catholick Authors hold, The Church can give Indulgences to the living, but not to the dead.* And in another place, *Diſp.* 53. *Sect.* 1. he names *Hoſtienſis*, who abſolutely denies, that *Indulgences* avail the dead.

Bellarmin, (*lib.* 1. c. 14.) affirms the

the same of *Gerson*, and produceth his reason, to wit, because Indulgences are ordained for those that submit to the Court of Mercy, which lasts even to death, and no farther; and that the grant of *Indulgences* is not an act of Jurisdiction over Purgatory. And the same *Suarez* witnesseth, that among those who admit *Indulgences*, some will not allow, that private suffrages offer'd for the dead have that efficacy as to be infallibly accepted, and some are of Opinion, that the Sacrifice of the Mass hath it not; and that there is no work that can *ex opere operato* free a soul from *Purgatory* by a certain and infallible Law. In fine, we have no Divine Promise upon which we may ground a certainty for the effect of *Indulgences*, and therefore we conclude them given only by way of Suffrage.

CHAP. XVII.

What CERTAINTY there is in the foresaid DOCTRINES.

SOme may object, Though these four Doctrines above mentioned are not admitted to be of Faith, have they nothing of certainty in them? *Suares* [*disp.* 49. *Sect.* 12.] delivers his own sence thus: *We ought to say, There is a power in the Church of granting Indulgences by which souls are freed from the punishment due before God for sinnes remitted:* And again, *I say, The Church has power to grant such Indulgences, as that thereby the temporal punishment due before God may be remitted, even without the Sacrament of Penance.* I hold this assertion certain, for it depends upon what I have already shewed, making appear, that there is a power in the

the Church of granting Indulgences, and that by Indulgences are understood a true Remission, which hath this very effect before-mentioned. He endeavors to prove it from several *Decretals* contain'd in the Cannon Law, and from divers *Bulls*, in which this use of Indulgences is allowed; and by the common practice of the present Church; for otherwayes (as he sayes) it would be esteem'd a gross error both in practise and morality: And though we should condescend to what some Catholicks avow, That the use of Indulgences is not very ancient, but began in the time of S. *Gregory*, yet it cannot be reputed an errour, considering how generally it is receiv'd and practic'd in the Church.

The same Author, [*disp.* 53. *Sect.* 1.] demanding what certainty is produced concerning Indulgences for the dead? answers; That because anciently the matter was not declar'd

declar'd in the Church, some Catholiques have doubted of it, but now the practice is so constant, that it cannot be rejected without danger of Error. First, by the common Opinion of the Schoolmen: Secondly, by the Practice of the Church: Thirdly, by the Authority of many Popes, who both in Fact and Doctrine have confirmed this Tenet. And *Bellarmin*, *lib.* 1. chap. 14. teacheth the same, saying, *It is certain, and undoubted, that by* Indulgences *the souls in Purgatory may be relieved.*

Suarez, in his Treatise of the *Treasure of the Church*, teaches thus, *We ought to say, That the Treasure of the Church is not only compos'd of the Merits of* Christ, *but also of the Merits of Saints.* This Assertion I hold certain. And a little after he adds, *Some will needs say, That Good Works (as to the force of* Satisfaction*) are so individually*

dually belonging to him that acts or suffers, that no man besides Jesus Christ can bestow the merit upon another; Conformably to which Opinion we must deduce this Consequence, That the Treasure of the Church is not compos'd of the Merits of Saints, and, that nothing of them can be apply'd by way of Indulgence to the remitting of temporal pain. But I conceive, this Opinion (in as much as it excludes the Merits of Saints from the Treasure of the Church, and the use of Indulgences) to be erroneous, and ought to be avoided, in regard it contradicts the common Opinion of Divines, and the accustomed practice of the Faithfull, and besides it supposeth a false ground, that one just man cannot satisfie for another; and it contradicts the usual stile of the Popes, &c. And again, I hold this Opinion, That one Faithfull cannot satisfie for another, is false, and very new in Divinity, and therefore

fit

fit to be avoided as a matter of importance: Hitherto *Suares*: who without doubt ought to be understood, when he urgeth these four certainties, in such a sence, as not to condemn these Authors of temerity who hold the contrary. For, if we should understand *Suares* in that sence, he would appear temerarious himself, in condemning others of temerity, and contradict his own general Principles, touching what is certain, and what not; but in a moderate sence they may be termed certainties.

Du Moulin, in his *Judg of Controversies*, delivers his minde thus, *When several Persons of knowledg and Authority decide a difficulty, and chiefly, when they are such, to whom God commands to pay a reverence and respect, it is a shamefull thing to contradict, or not to submit to their judgment*: And is not the

same

ſame Rule of Prudence requir'd in our Queſtion?

But in caſe ſome perſons, of a more rigid diſpoſition, refuſe to ſubſcribe to theſe four rehearſed Opinions, by reaſon Antiquity took little or no notice of them, and the Council of *Trent* (though aſſembled ſpecially upon the Subject of *Indulgences*, at that time deni'd by the Proteſtants, both in themſelves, and in theſe four circumſtances) hath pronounced nothing in confirmation of theſe four points; yet it is agreed, that the Popes do what is not only good and profitable, but laudable in granting *Indulgences* for the dead, in diſtributing the Treaſure of the Church, in allowing a Remiſſion of Puniſhment due before God, and an application of Satisfactions, performed for others: For, in all theſe they take a ſure way, and the Faithfull ought to be zealous in the gaining *Indulgences*: Since if theſe Doctrines

ctrines be true, as they are piously believed, the effect will follow; If they want a solid Foundation, at least, the effect cannot be other than good, since thereby the Faithfull are invited to the performance of many special works of Piety and Charity, which never are unrewarded. And it is certain, That Physitian proceeds upon good Principles, and ought justly to be commended, that prescribes his Patient a Cordial, though he be not certain of the Effect, but only, that it can do no hurt, and may do good: So the Merchant in his Trade, and every Sober man in what he undertakes, proceeds prudently, though the gain be uncertain; which is plainly our case in the matter of *Indulgences* for the Dead, and saying Mass on priviledg'd Altars.

This seems agreeable to what *Vasques teacheth, lib.* 2. *p.* 5. That the Church proceeds sometimes in her

her practice upon a probable Opinion without declaring it to be of Faith, in which she swerves not from the rule of prudence and reason, as may be demonstrated in this particular of *Indulgences*, and shall appear more apparently in what I am to say in the next Chapter.

Notwithstanding, having a due regard to the weakness of our Separatists, whom we would willingly perswade into the bosome of the Catholick Church, by making the way as easie as we can. And since neither our *Profession of Faith*, nor the *Council of Trent*, take any notice of these Four Heads, or Circumstances, the best way to deal with them is, not to press these opinions at all: For why should we propose more to them then what our Profession of Faith, and the General Council engage us to? Is it not sufficient to make a man a true childe of the Church, if he submits to these? and

why

why should we be more exact, and rigid, than the Councils and the Popes? And in case our Separatists should of themselves urge these Four Heads, the shortest answer, and freest from all exception is, That since our Profession of Faith and the Council of *Trent*, are silent in these Questions, and that to submit, so far as they command, is abundantly sufficient to make a man a good *Catholike*, the other *Queres* will for the present rather appear a Digression than otherwise; but being once received into the Church, the Piety and probability of those Opinions will soon be illustrated, and grow more credible. In fine, Let us press no farther than the words of our Profession of Faith imports, to wit, I BELIEVE, THAT THE POWER OF INDULGENCES HATH BEEN GIVEN, AND LEFT TO THE CHURCH,

BY

her practice upon a probable Opinion without declaring it to be of Faith, in which she swerv's not from the rule of prudence and reason, as may be demonstrated in this particular of *Indulgences*, and shall appear more apparently in what I am to say in the next Chapter.

Notwithstanding, having a due regard to the weakness of our Separatists, whom we would willingly perswade into the bosome of the Catholick Church, by making the way as easie as we can. And since neither our *Profession of Faith*, nor the *Council of Trent*, take any notice of these Four Heads, or Circumstances, the best way to deal with them is, not to press these opinions at all: For why should we propose more to them then what our Profession of Faith, and the General Council engage us to? Is it not sufficient to make a man a true childe of the Church, if he submits to these? and why

why ſhould we be more exact, and rigid, than the Councils and the Popes? And in caſe our Separatiſts ſhould of themſelves urge theſe Four Heads, the ſhorteſt anſwer, and freeeſt from all exception is, That ſince our Profeſſion of Faith and the Council of *Trent*, are ſilent in theſe Queſtions, and that to ſubmit, ſo far as they command, is abundantly ſufficient to make a man a good *Catholike*, the other *Queres* will for the preſent rather appear a Digreſſion than otherwiſe; but being once received into the Church, the Piety and probability of thoſe Opinions will ſoon be illuſtrated, and grow more credible. In fine, Let us preſs no farther than the words of our Profeſſion of Faith imports, to wit, I BELIEVE, THAT THE POWER OF INDULGENCES HATH BEEN GIVEN, AND LEFT TO THE CHURCH, BY

BY *JESUS CHRIST*; AND, THAT THE USE OF THEM IS WHOLSOME, AND BENEFICIAL TO CHRISTIAN PEOPLE. Let us go no farther, but follow the advice of the Apoſtle, *Let none preſume to be more wiſe than behoves, but be wiſe unto ſobriety.*

CHAP. XVIII.

What is leſs certain concerning INDULGENCES.

IT is ſo far from being an Article of Faith, that there is little or no certainty, whether, when *Indulgences* are granted, it be upon a ſufficient Conſideration; As when a large *Indulgence* is granted, for repeating ſome few Prayers, or giving ſome petty Alms, or ſaying Maſs

Mass for the Dead, on a priviledg'd Altar, and consequently, whether such Indulgences be available: this I prove, 1. Because neither the Council of *Trent*, nor any other, teaches us to believe, that such *Indulgences*, so frequent, with such circumstances, for such causes, as for one Mass, one Communion, or a few short Prayers, are available. Nay the Council of *Trent* adviseth, that great care and moderation be held in the granting of *Indulgences* according to the ancient and approved custome of the Church, which questionless was not to give such a multitude of *Indulgences* upon so slender Considerations.

2. Both by Authority and Reasons alledg'd by *Bellarmin* in his Treatise of *Indulgences*. *All generally agree* (sayes he) *that an* Indulgence *without a just*, that is, *sufficient Motive is not of force to expiate the Obligation of pain due before*

before God either in this life or the next: and, having proved it amply, adds: Hence ariſeth a Queſtion, Whether to the ſufficiency of the cauſe there is not required ſome proportion betwixt the work enjoyn'd, and the *Indulgence*? Or whether large *Indulgences* may be granted upon the performance of ſmall works. The firſt Opinion is, of thoſe who maintain, that the proportion is not requiſite, but it ſufficeth, if the cauſe be pious, and not for the performance of ſome vain act, or purely temporal, unbelonging to the honor of God; but for any work whatſoever, if it tend to the Glory of God, and the good of his Church. The Reaſons for this Opinion are, for the moſt part taken from the common Practice of the Church.

But thoſe that favor the contrary Opinion ſay, That, to the end the cauſe may be juſt, it is required

quired, that the work be not only pious, but hold ſome proportion with the *Indulgence*: inſomuch, that if a great indulgence be granted upon a ſlender cauſe, it will not prove effectual: As this is the more generally received Opinion, ſo it ſeems to me (ſaith *Bellarmine*) the more rational and true; And I hold, for example, if a plenary *Indulgence*, ſhould be granted for once ſaying our Lords prayer, for the converſion of Hereticks, or for giving a ſmall Charity towards the recovery of the Holy Land, it would not be available.

In fine, to make the cauſe juſt, 'tis neceſſary, that the thing required by the *Indulgence* be more gratefull to God, and more profitable to his Church, than the penitential ſatisfaction remitted by the *Indulgence*. But (the Cardinal adds) we muſt obſerve, that, as there ought to be a juſt conſideration, or cauſe, ſo it doth not appertain to every

man to judg of it, nor take the liberty of cenſuring *Indulgences* as ſome Authors do.

And herein *Clement* the 8th is much to be commended for his care and Providence in executing the Decree of the Council of *Lateran* under *Innocent* the 3d, concerning the diſcreet moderation of *Indulgences*, and the Decree of the Council of *Trent* for reducing them to the ancient cuſtome approved in the Church: For it is well known the Ancients were very reſerved in this particular, ſince *Sergius* 2*dus* granted only for three years, and *Paſcalis* for 40 dayes. And ther, having raiſed this Objection, That if *Indulgences* granted without ſome conſiderable cauſe were not valid, Chriſtian people would be much deceived by their Paſtors, which ought not to be admitted, anſwers thus: *There is generally no danger of deceit, for the people are taught*

it is an Article of Faith, That there is a power in the Church of granting Indulgences, *but not, that it cannot happen, This particular* Indulgence *may be unvallid, or unbeneficial; which, as it may happen ſometimes for want of Authority in the giver, ſo alſo ſometimes through deficiency in the cauſe. And therefore, all well adviſed Chriſtians ſo accept of* Papal Indulgences, *as that beſides them they are carefull to perform works worthy of Penance, and make ſatisfaction for their ſinnes:* Hitherto *Bellarmin.*

How little reaſon our *Separatiſts* have to refuſe an Agreement and Subſcription to Indulgences thus expounded and aſſerted in the terms of our Profeſſion of Faith, extracted out of the Council of *Trent*, I leave to the Readers Judgment, having firſt duely weighed their own conſtant Principles and Tenets.

Du Moulin (in his *Buckler of Faith*, *p.*15.) hath theſe words. *It is falſ, that we affirm, The Church of God wants power to remit ſins. The Faithfull Paſtors enjoy this power. The Scripture ſaith, The Paſtors pardon ſins, becauſe God makes uſe of them to pardon ſins.* This is in effect the Pardons and *Indulgences* which the Pope grants, becauſe God makes uſe of him to pardon ſins. He proves this at large from ſeveral texts of Scripture, *Mat.*16.19.& 18.19. *Jo.* 20. 23. And in his 5th §. of the ſame Work he will have it, That all Paſtors enjoy this Power equally, and adds, That when the ſin is remitted, all temporal puniſhment is remitted at the ſame time; and by this Tenet they allow all their Paſtors the Power of remitting both ſin and the Puniſhment due before God to ſin; which in effect makes them all Popes at large, and inveſts them confidently in that Papal Power, which by grave Authors is queſtioned in the Catholique

lique Church: Why do these men quarrel with us about *Indulgences*? They remit the Penances enjoyn'd by their Discipline, and the Pope those by the Cannon-Law: We teach, that in some cases (the sin being remitted (there remains yet due a temporal Punishment; But the Ministers confidently pardon both the one and the other, and that without the help of a Sacrament, not esteeming Penance to be any, and without going farther than their *Justifying Faith*, they dispatch the whole work. Is not this to believe, and admit of much more than we do? We teach, that Priests forgive sins by the help of a Sacrament, where *Confession* is requir'd, & a deep sorrow for sins committed, with a firm purpose of amendment, & yet after all this oftentimes there remains a temporal punishment due, which is piously believ'd may be remitted by *Indulgences*.

Who is it now that attributes more to men according to their

proper grounds and Tenets, either we or our Adverſaries? without doubt they. For every Miniſter, according to their Principles, for all ſinns, and at all times, grants *plenary Indulgence*, yet they are angry with the Pope for doing far leſs, and more ſeldome. In a word, They give the largeſt Pardons that can be imagin'd, without reſervation of Caſes, without the help of a Sacrament, and at the ſame time free the Soul from all temporal Puniſhment, which is much more than we attribute to the greateſt of our *Indulgences*.

Of

CHAP. XIX.

Of the OBLIGATION *due to* CONSTITUTIONS *and* HUMANE LAWES, *as well* ECCLESIASTICAL *as* CIVIL.

WE have done with the *Rule of Faith*, and the Application of it to the Principal points of Controverſie. Let us now deſcend to the Queſtion of Lawes and Manners mentioned in this Chapter. The Council of *Trent* ſpeaks thus: *If any one ſaith, That a juſtified man is not obliged to obſerve the Commandments of God, and the Church*, Anathema. *If any one ſaith, That thoſe who are baptiſed are freed from the Precepts of the holy Church, as well written as delivered by Tradition, and that*

they are not obliged to the performance of them, Anathema. And again, *The holy Synod exhorts all Paſtors carefully to recommend unto the Faithfull a due obedience, principally in thoſe things that belong to the mortification of the fleſh, as the diſtinction of meats by abſtenance, and faſts; or what concerns the encreaſe of Piety, as the devout and Religious obſervation of Feſtival dayes; adverti ſing the people often to yeild obedience to their Superiours, and that thoſe who hearken to them, hearken to God, the rewarder of all good; and who deſpiſe them will finde that God is their revenger.* This is the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, and muſt be obey'd, as proceeding from a *General Council*, without any alteration, diminution, or augmentation. For the better underſtanding hereof, and to open a way of Agreement, or rather to ſhow, That our Adverſaries neither

do

do not can call this to queſtion, if we adhere truly to the words of the Council, I thought good to premiſe theſe Four Animadverſions.

The firſt is, That the Council ſpeaks not of any yoke of conſcience nor Obligation under pain of mortal ſin, nor yet of venial; ſhe abſtains from theſe Expreſſions which are frequent among Divines, though there wanted not eminent perſons of that Profeſſion in the Council.

The Second is, That ſhe alledgeth no other Proofs to teſtifie our Obedience to our Superiours, and their Lawes, but theſe Texts out of Scripture, *Heb.* 13. 17. *Obey your Prelates, and be ſubject to them.* Luk. 10.16. *He who hears you, hears me, who reſiſts power, reſiſts the Ordinance of God, and thoſe that reſiſt bring damnation upon themſelves. Therefore be ſubject of neceſſity, not only for wrath, but alſo for conſcience ſake,* Rom. 13. 2, 5.

The third is, That the Miniſters in their *Geneva* Bible, upon the laſt cited words, uſe this Expreſſion, *Not only for the fear of Puniſhment, but alſo for that fear which is due to God by reaſon of his Ordinance*: And in their 40th Article thus, *We hold, That we ought to obey the Lawes and Statutes of our Superiors, eſteeming them the Lieutenants and Officers of God.* Therefore, according to *Geneva*, we ought to obey the Lawes and Statutes of our Superiours, not only for fear of Puniſhment, but alſo for the fear that is due to God in reſpect of his Ordinance: this being in effect as much as the Council exacts.

The Fourth is thus expreſs'd by *Vaſques, l. 2. diſp. 158. ch. 2.* It is not certain, that either Secular, or Eccleſiaſtical Princes have received from God a particular warrant to oblige, under mortal ſin, beſides the ordinary power they have

have to govern their Subjects: The Eccleſiaſtical, as they are deputed by God; and the Secular, as from the Common-wealth, from whence proceeds naturally an Authority to oblige their Inferiours by their Lawes according to the quality of the matter: and though neither Secular nor Eccleſiaſtical power can pretend to chaſtiſe their Delinquents with the pains of Hell, yet nature teacheth us, that Diſobedience to our Parents, or Superiours in things lawfull and honeſt, is a Crime, according to the quality of the matter; Diſobedience to Superiours being in it ſelf againſt right Reaſon, and nature. Of Tranſgreſſions ſome are mortal, ſome venial, in regard both being againſt Law and Reaſon, the one offends grievouſly, the other lightly; But that which highly oppoſeth Reaſon and Law, highly offends God, and conſequently, renders a man guilty of his diſ-

pleaſure,

pleaſure, and what highly diſpleaſeth God, diſſolves his love to man, and of it ſelf deſerves eternal Puniſhment, not becauſe God hath particularly conſtituted and appointed the Law, and threatned the Tranſgreſſors with ſuch a Puniſhment, but becauſe the fault of it ſelf deſerves that Puniſhment. For God would proceed unjuſtly (which cannot be imagin'd) if he ſhould inflict Eternal Puniſhment upon a fault not deſerving it; no leſs than another Judg in the ſame caſe; and with the ſame Puniſhment ſhall they be chaſtiſed, who, having no knowledg of any other Law, but that of nature, have committed this ſin, according to the words of S. *Paul*: *Thoſe that have ſinned without the Law, ſhall periſh without the Law*: By which he ſhews, that they ſhall be judged by the verdict of Reaſon, againſt

againſt which they have ſinned. Hence it followes, that the only Tranſgreſſion of the Law of Nature renders a man guilty of Eternal pains, though in effect this ſeems to be done by the only will of God.

The ſame Author, [*diſp.* 154. *chap.* 2. | purſuing his Subject, ſaith, The Pope cannot oblige, under pain of mortal ſin, by vertue of receiving a power from him who can puniſh with Eternal fire; it being not certain, that the Pope hath received any ſuch expreſs authority; but as he hath the right of Eccleſiaſticalp over inveſted in him he may juſtly command; and to diſobey him is both wicked and irrational, which Argument hath alſo force in a ſecular Prince.

Vaſques goes on, ſaying, Upon this

this Universal Principle of the right of Nature (to wit, that we must obey our Superiours) is built the whole frame of humane Law; for it is not in the will of a humane Legislator to oblige, or not oblige, by his Law, but only to command, or not command, to promulgate, or not promulgate: But the Law being made, and the commandment given, the Law of Nature obligeth us to obedience: and therefore the measure of our Obligation is to be taken from the Law it self, and natural Reason, after a due Promulgation of the positive Law, by our Superiour; Hitherto *Vasques*. By which it is clear, That 'tis not the Superior, nor the Law that obligeth the conscience under penalty of sin, or imposeth any yoke upon it, but God, and the Law of nature, which, supposing a positive Law, enacted and promulgated, obligeth to the performance of it.

According

According to these Four Animadversions, and containing our selves purely within the Terms of the Council of *Trent*, I cannot discover any possible difference with our Separatists in this point; For, how can they swerve from what I have alledged out of *Vasques*, *That no humane Law either Ecclesiastical or civil doth oblige under mortal sin, nor impose a yoke upon the conscience* (which are the very terms of the Separatists in their 24th Article) *but only in regard God, by his Holy Writ, and the Law of Nature, obligeth us to obey our Superiours, and Parents.* Thus much all men grant, and none can deny, that Superiours can make Laws; Therefore who disobeys his Superiours, and the Laws enacted by them, doth transgress the Law of God, which obliges us in conscience to obey our Superiours. This is sufficient for a submission to the Council of *Trent*,

in

in this point, and consequently to be esteem'd a good *Catholique*.

Vasques affirm's confidently, that no Law is of Force, if not received by the people, the Legislators conniving and consenting to their refusal; From whence many differences will cease, and many calumnies raised by the Separatists, and particularly, by *du Moulin*, *Daillé*, &c. who accuse the Church of forbidding the use of the Bible in the vulgar tongue. And the Fathers of *Trent* (saith *du Moulin*) affirms, That the Reading of Scriptures breeds more hurt than good to the people; though neither out Profession of Faith, nor the said Council mention any thing at all, by way of forbidding the use of the Bible, in the vulgar Tongue; wherefore this bold assertion will amount to a most impudent lye: All that the Council sayes, is in the Decree concerning the choice of Books, *Sess.* 18. *The holy*

holy Synod (perceiving, that the number of ſuſpected and dangerous Books is too much encreaſed, in which many impure Doctrines are contained, and divulged) hath reſolved, that ſome Fathers be deputed to enquire diligently, what is fit to be done in the cenſure of ſuch Books, and report it in due time to the Council, that theſe extravagant Doctrines may be the more eaſily ſeparated, as cockle from the wheat of Chriſtian Truth: and ſomething deliberated on, and reſolved more conveniently to that purpoſe. Here is no mention at all of the *Bible* in the Vulgar Tongue, nor of any danger in the reading it, though this is all that can be gather'd from the Vote of the Council of *Trent.*

Some are not a little ſurpris'd, in that divers Bookſellers have bound up the *Index Expurgatorius* with the Decrees of that Council, and look upon it as a part of the Council,

or

or at leaſt proceeding from thence, though it never related to it, nor had any approbation from it, and much leſs did it ever forbid the uſe of the Bible in the vulgar Tongue, but only ſpeaks diſcreetly, and adviſeth, that this matter be referr'd either to the Biſhop, or to the Paſtor, or to the Ghoſtly Father, by reaſon of weak and ill compoſed Spirits, which are apt to draw evil from God. Theſe Lawes which are meerly humane, are often reſembled to *Medals* which have two faces, and vary according to the times and circumſtances. It is certain, that the reading of Scripture is both holy and uſefull, and yet accidently may occaſion evil. In the ſixt Rule of the *Index* is ſaid, That the reading of the Books of Controverſie, which are written in a vulgar Language, ought not generally to be permitted, no more than the Bible written in the ſame, but ſtill with reſpect

respect to the advice of S. *Peter*, (2 Ep. 3.16.) that *there are hard passages in the Epistles of* S. *Paul*, (and the same may be affirmed of other Texts) *which the ignorant and unstable deprave to their own perdition*; and therefore, in these we ought to proceed with the advice of our Directors. And this is as much as the *Index* endeavors to prevent, which yet is of no Obligation in *France*, nor any of the Bulls of *Rome* that maintain it.

From the same Rule of *Vasques*, common to all Divines, it follows also, That neither these Bulls, nor a great number of other *Canons*, *Constitutions* and *Decrees*, concerning manners, even of General Councils, and with greater reason of *Popes*, oblige not here among us, nor in many other Kingdomes.

Again it follows, in what sence these words of our *Profession* are to be understood. *I promise and swear true obedience to the Pope, or Bishop of* Rome, *and receive and Profess undoubtedly*

undoubtedly all things ordain'd, defin'd, and declar'd by the holy Canons, and œcumenical Councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent. To which I answer, whatsoever is defin'd to be of Faith by a General Council, is held to be of Faith by all the Faithfull; and it is not necessary for this effect, and to render it of obligation, that it be accepted by the people, since truth it self is independent of all admission. But it is not so of Lawes, which must be both promulgated and receiv'd before they are of force.

Much less obligation have we as Catholicks, to particular Devotions, and *Confraternities* of the *Rosary*, *Scapulary*, &c. now in practice. For of these there is no mention at all in our Profession of Faith, nor in the Council of *Trent*: and concerning the *Indulgences* belonging to the foresaid *Confraternities*, we ought to judg of them as in the precedent Chapter

of

of *Indulgences*, and no otherwayes; Wherefore our Separatists ought not to retard their submission to the Church upon the Calumnies and jeers rais'd by some Ministers in derision of these particular Devotions, which (though not at all reprehensible in themselves, if rightly understood) may be omitted without either prejudice to Faith, or the Unity of the Church.

CHAP. XX.

Concerning some ERRORS *proceeding from* IGNORANCE, *which ought to be laid aside.*

St. *Austin* [*lib.* 20. *chap.* 21.] (writing against *Faustus* the Manichean) having set down the Doctrine of the Catholique Church, goes on thus, *Christian people celebrate*

celebrate the memory of Martyrs with a Religious ſolemnity, that thereby they may be excited to their imitation, aſſociated to their merits, and aſſiſted by their Prayers: Yet we do not offer Sacrifice to the Martyrs, but to the God of Martyrs; though it is confeſs'd, we erect Altars, in the Memories, that is, Churches of Martyrs: and if any man ſhould fall into this or any other Error, he is ſoon reprehended by the wholſome Doctrine of the Church, either to be corrected, condemned, or avoided.

Of this nature are divers Errors derived from the practice of weak and ignorant perſons, as alſo others falſly objected by our Adverſaries, and diſavowed by the Church, particularly concerning *Indulgences*, and the *Lives of Saints*, which were clear'd by the grounds of our *Rule of Faith*, in their proper places.

Du Moulin ſcoffingly writes, That

That the Book of *Roman Indulgences* ſayes, that at S. *Euſebius* in Rome there are every day to be gain'd 78 thouſand years of pardon, and as many *Quarantena's* or 40 dayes, and at S. *Laurence* both a Plenary Indulgence, and beſides for 11000 years, and 48 *Quarantena's*. &c. But *the true Hyſtoryes of* Roman *Indulgences, ſays* Bellarmin, *are not to be taken from Enemies, no nor from I know not what petty Books, ſuch as* Kemnitius *ſayes, he has ſeen one printed at* Norimberg, *compos'd in the* German *Tongue, with great amplifications of ſuch Indulgences; but from the Papal Bulls themſelves, and the Records of the Churches: For no doubt but in ſuch little, incertain and nameleſs Pamphlets we may meet with many fictious and corrupted Stories, of which* Bellarmin *gives ſome Inſtances. and then ſayes, Never did I read in any approved Authors, that Indulgences for thouſands*

thousands of dayes or years were ever granted; (much less for hundreds of thousands, and Quarantena's besides:) nor do there want Authors, who deny that the Popes ever gave such Indulgences remissive of penance for many thousand years; but say, they were the inventions of the Questors; so Jehu Gerson, *and* Dominicus Sotus: *For the Popes used only to grant Indulgences for so many years as the Penance enjoyned should otherwise have lasted; which ordinarily was* 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, *or* 20 *years, or at most, for ones life.*

As for the *Legends*, which the Ministers both in their Books and Sermons cry out so clamorously against, and so boldly charge as own'd by the Church of *Rome*, 'tis a meer Calumny to impose them on her; but I hope, I have already sufficiently cleared this point, not admitting many of the Stories of *Jacobus de Voragine*, and *Simeon Meta-*

Metaphrastes, to be ſo much as true, or even probable; ſo far are we from holding them as parts of our Faith: How many of theſe are rejected by *Baronius*, and after him by *Ribadeneira*? Does not *Bellarmin* too cenſure ſuch Writers, as perſons who added of their own heads and Inventions, what might have been true, not what was? However our ſhort anſwer is, There's none of all this in our *Profeſſion*, nor in the Council of *Trent*.

But above all they will needs perſwade us, that the common people adore Saints, and Pictures, as they do God, and in their Objections fancy to themſelves ſuch groſs Errors as are beneath the loweſt Capacities. *Daillé* will have it, that the people ſpend all their Devotions upon Pictures, nay that they make no difference betwixt the Picture and the Prototype, nay, which is yet more ſottiſh, not even

betwixt the Picture of one Object and of another. *Du-moulin* is ſo impudent as to deliver upon his credit, that the *Catholiques in their Letany, ſay, St. Peter pray for us; but when they come to our Lady, they ſay not, holy Mary pray for us, no more than to our Saviour* Jeſus Chriſt. The ſame Author affirms, confidently, *That the Popes have placed their Decrees and Canons not onely in the ſame rank with the holy Scripture, but above it*: And again, *That in the Canon of the Maſs our B. Lady is preferr'd before our Saviour, and placed in a ſuperiour forme*; with a thouſand other Calumnies and lies, broach'd moſt out of malice and many out of Ignorance; to which I only return this general anſwer; Nothing of all this is found in our *Profeſſion of Faith*, nor *General Councils*, which is ſufficient for a rational man not be diverted out of his courſe of

ſeeking

ſeeking repoſe and Salvation in the *Catholique Church.*

CHAP. XXI.

The BENEFIT of thus ſevering FAITH from OPINIONS.

I Have repreſented in general, and in particular, the Importance of this exact ſeparation, and ſhew'd, that it is not only rational but neceſſary: I have alſo noted the utilities that accrue from thence, which appear more evidently, and will be more eaſily comprehended by the application made to the ſeveral Subjects.

I. I can juſtly ſay, That this Separation is a brief and ſolid Anſwer to nine parts of ten, of all that is objected by the Miniſters, in

their Books and Sermons; for when we lay aſide School-queſtions, problematical opinions, popular Errors, and apparent calumnies, we take away their Armes, oblige them to ſilence, or to fight with windemils of their own making, or elſe to make uſe of their Sophiſtry and Fallacies, expounded very well by *du Moulin* in his *Elements of Logick*, called *Ignoratio Elenchi*; which is, for example, when one arguing againſt me, produceth a *Concluſion*, which he offers as a contradiction to what I maintain; and yet in effect it doth not prejudice me at all, but may ſafely be granted: This is termed, *Ignoratio Elenchi*; and this is for the moſt part our caſe, ſince their Objections above mentioned (not at all contradicting our Articles of Faith) compoſe at leaſt nine parts in ten of their whole Volumes: whileſt they never produce either Scripture, General Councils, or Fathers,

Fathers, clearly teaching their Doctrine; For Example, That in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt there is no true and real preſence of the body of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and, that there is no converſion of the ſubſtance of the bread into his body, which we call *Tranſubſtantiation*; nor what is contained in their 36th Article; *He nouriſheth us with the ſubſtance of his body, by Faith.* Turn over all their Books, and your ſhall never finde theſe Propoſitions, either in expreſs Terms, or deducible by neceſſary Conſequences: And therefore you ought not to take notice of their Extravagancies, but oblige your ſelf to this ſtrict Separation, by which you put them either to ſilence, or to fight with their own ſhadowes. And ſince they pretend to reform us by Scripture, it is both fit and neceſſary they ſhould produce ſome pregnant and pertinent Texts, to confirm their own, and

diſcover the Errors of our Tenets.

II. By this means alſo is compaſs'd an eaſie way to invite our Separatiſts to a Reunion with the Church, to deteſt their Schiſm, and to abjure their Errors, contrary to our Profeſſion of Faith; ſince the main miſtake conſiſts in that they are perſwaded the Church holds for Articles of Faith what ſhe never propoſeth to be believed, but leavs all men to their freedome in School-queſtions, and problematical Opinions.

III. This Separation alſo diminiſheth ſo much the number of points in debate, that I dare confidently affirm, there will not remain a third part to be argued, whereas the accuſtomed mixture cauſeth an encreaſe without end, and if you ſhould deduct out of *Bellarmin*, and other Writers of Controverſie, what really belongs not to Faith, you would much abbreviate their large Volumns;

Volumns; perhaps of Forty debated Queſtions, thirty five would be unneceſſary: And why is not the ſhorteſt way with all poſſible Charity to be endeavour'd, ſince the end is ſo important, and ſo much to be deſired?

IV. This confuſed mixture puts us often to the plunge, to finde out convincing Proofs againſt our Adverſaries, and leavs ſometimes under ſome difficulty even a true Article of Faith; For ſince the debates conſiſt, for the moſt part, of points, which indeed are not of Faith, how is it poſſible to bring Arguments convincive, that they are of Faith?

V. Few of us by reaſon of ſuch mixture are able to manage ſuch Diſputes, and aſſuredly prove even our Faith it ſelf; For few are well vers'd in the whole latitude and numerous variety of School-Opinions, for which ſome of our own Doctors, though very learned, decline

decline ſometimes to enter into ſuch Conferences. Few alſo of our Separatiſts, for the ſame cauſe, are capable of Inſtruction, until they receive a true Information of what is, and what is not of Faith, themſelves being generally little acquainted with Scholaſtik ſubtleties.

FINIS.

POSTSCRIPT.

Some exception having been taken at the Tranſlation of two Lines, or rather two Words in this Book, 'tis thus offer'd to every impartial Reader: The Latine is, Non omnes praxes Eccleſiæ, etiam univerſalis, ſunt ſufficientes fundando articulo fidei Catholicæ. *The French,* La Practique de l'Egliſe en ſes Loix & Ordonnances ne conſtituë pas des Articles de foy. *The Engliſh thus,* p. 12. *The practice even of the univerſal Church is no ſufficient ground for an Article of Catholique Faith, The Objectors ſay it ſhould be,* NOT EVERY practice, even of the univerſal Church, is a ſufficient ground for an Article of Catholick Faith. *And ſo indeed it had been more preciſely* literal, *but the other is as preciſely* true; *ſince in truth not onely* not every *Practice of the Church, but no practice,* as ſuch, *is a ſufficient*

sufficient ground for an Article of Catholique Faith. For every Practice may pretend to it, as well as any. Nor have those very Practices, which are held unrefusable without Heresie, this priviledge, barely from their being Practices; but because themselves are grounded on some Article of Faith, from whence they receive the Degree of their Dignity, antecedently to the credit they gain by being Practices.

1. *Thus, the Translation has this security, that it is not against Truth; since if we can assign any* one *Practice of the universal Church, which is no sufficient ground for an Article of Faith, it evidently followes, That* the Practice of the universal Church is no sufficient ground, *&c. Perhaps the Objectors reflect not on the several placings of the* Negative. Not every Practice is sufficient----*says the Latin:* The practice is no sufficient----*says the English; which throughly considered*

considered, bear in effect both the same sence; and this alone is enough to justifie the Translation. But

2. *Though the Original be more wary to prevent captious Exceptions (from which that good man was not altogether secure,) yet the Translation (if perfectly understood) seems more conformable to the Reason mentioned even in the Original;* Not every Practice, *&c.* Because (*says the Doctor in the Latine*) those Practices are not Propositions made by the Church of a Truth to be beleeved, but of a Thing to be done. *Which is a clear, judicious and very usefull Distinction, plainly expressing the Authors sence, and absolutely justifying the Translators. And this in the end of the same Paragraph he again repeats in these words (without the limitation of* non omnes) Praxes enim sunt variabiles, utpote præcepta; nullo autem modo dogmata fidei variari possunt, quippè veritas invariabilis, &c.

3. *The*

3. *The Translation is not onely* ſuitable *both to Truth, and to the Context of the Author; But perhaps more* proper *thus, then if it follow'd the Letter, which will easily be granted by those who consider a Practice of the Church precisely in its own nature, for so it cannot, with any propriety, be call'd the* Ground *of an Article of Faith; well may an Article of Faith be the* Ground *of it. A* Proof *may sometimes be drawn from a Practice, to argue a Point of Faith, and a conformity must alwayes be yielded to a Practice of the Church: But neither of these necessarily import, that the Practice is alwayes grounded on a Point of Faith, much less, the* Ground *of a Point of Faith.*

The same Discourse proceeds in Church Ordinances, Laws, &c. *(mentioned in the French Edition) none of them,* as such, *being a sufficient Ground for an Article of Faith; Though any of the Three (Laws, Ordinances,*

dinances, or Practices of the Church) are not onely to be without dispute obeyed, but sometimes so grounded on Faith, that they cannot be rejected, without denying Faith it self: Yet even in those Cases, the Practice alone obliges us not to so high an assent; but the attestation of the Church, that the Point is a Doctrine reveal'd by God to his Apostles, and from them descended to us.

And so, if the Letter *of the Translation vary a little from the Originals, yet neither its Sence nor Letter endeavour the least prejudice to any Truth; and consequently not worth contending about, unless by such as neglect the Substance to catch at Shadowes.*

FINIS.